

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH

NOV 30 1944

VOL. LXV, 4

WHOLE No. 260

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

Edited by

BENJAMIN D. MERITT

HAROLD F. CHERNISS, RICHARD M. HAYWOOD  
KEMP MALONE, HENRY T. ROWELL

Honorary Editor

DAVID MOORE ROBINSON

OCTOBER, 1944

BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND  
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Athenian Notes. By A. W. GOMME, . . . . .	321
"Epic, as I here define it." By SEYMOUR M. PITCHER, . . . . .	340
The Name of the Holy Grail. By LEO SPITZER, . . . . .	354
Latin Dii Indigetes, Dii Novensides, and the Designation of IE Kinship. By FRITZ MEZGER, . . . . .	364
Thomas Jefferson as a Philologist (II). By H. C. MONTGOMERY, . . . . .	367
The Latin Base of the Spanish Suffix <i>-eño</i> . By YAKOV MALKIEL, . . . . .	372
On the Unity of the <i>Miles Gloriosus</i> . By RICHARD M. HAYWOOD, . . . . .	382
A Note on the <i>Nicomachean Ethics</i> . By GLENN R. MORROW, . . . . .	386
REVIEWS: . . . . .	387
<i>Lobel, Roberts, and Wegener's The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XVIII. Edited with Translations and Notes (W. A. OLDFATHER and LLOYD W. DALY).—Venske's Die orphischen Argonautika in ihrem Verhältnis zu Apollonios Rhodios (HERMANN FRÄNKEL).—Laistner and King's A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts (S. HARRISON THOMSON).—Smith's Tiberius and the Roman Empire (VINCENT M. SCRAMUZZA).—Richter's Etruscan Art in the Museum. The Metropolitan Museum of Art: Handbook of the Etruscan Collection (DAVID M. ROBINSON).—Elferink's Het Oordeel van den Kerkvader Augustinus over de Romeinsche Oudheid. Bijdragen tot een commentaar op de eerste vijf boeken van "De Civitate Dei" (J. M. F. MARIQUE).—Weiss' Kausalität und Zufall in der Philosophie des Aristoteles (PHILLIP DE LACY).—Jones' The Vatnsdalers' Saga. Translated with an Introduction and Notes (STEFÁN EINARSSON).—Turyn's The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus (ALFRED C. SCHLESINGER).—Webster's Greek Interpretations (ALFRED C. SCHLESINGER).</i>	
BOOKS RECEIVED, . . . . .	419
INDEX TO VOLUME LXV, . . . . .	421

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology, and especially in the field of Greek and Roman studies. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage 25 cents extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the editor, Benjamin D. Meritt; proof should be returned to the secretary, Evelyn H. Clift, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

Contributors are entitled to receive twenty-five copies of their respective contributions free of charge. Additional copies will be supplied at cost.

Subscriptions, remittances, and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore 18, Md.

---

The contents of the American Journal of Philology are indexed regularly in the International Index to Periodicals.

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
BY J. H. FURST COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. LXV, 4

WHOLE No. 260

## ATHENIAN NOTES.

### 1. Athenian Politics, 510-483 B. C.

Recent studies by Ehrenberg,<sup>1</sup> Berve,<sup>2</sup> Robinson,<sup>3</sup> and McGregor<sup>4</sup> have done much to clear the air about this little-known period of Athenian political history; but it is still, I think, possible to get greater precision in the outline, provided that we remember that it is only in the outline that we can, on the present evidence, hope for any progress. Let me, in this connection, make one or two negative points:

1) It is wrong to interpret "Medism" and "Panhellenism" in this period in terms of the fourth century, or rather of Isocrates; for I do not think that Isocrates was representative of his century. Medism (i. e. a desire to be friendly with Persia) was not a crime in an individual if his state was not at war with Persia, nor a treaty with the King wrong in a Greek state—certainly not, unless Persia was attacking neighbouring Greek states at the time. It is this which invalidates Walker's<sup>5</sup> attack on Cleisthenes for the embassy to Sardes in 506,<sup>6</sup> even if he was right, as he may very well have been, in saddling Cleisthenes with

<sup>1</sup> V. Ehrenberg, *Ost und West: Studien zur geschichtlichen Problematik der Antike* (Prague, 1935), especially chap. V, "Die Generation von Marathon."

<sup>2</sup> H. Berve, *Die Antike*, XII (1936), pp. 1-28; *idem*, *Miltiades (Hermes, Einzelschriften, Heft 2, 1937)*.

<sup>3</sup> C. A. Robinson, Jr., *A. J. P.*, LX (1939), pp. 232-7.

<sup>4</sup> M. F. McGregor, *Athenian Studies presented to W. S. Ferguson, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Suppl. I (1940), pp. 71-95.

<sup>5</sup> E. M. Walker, *C. A. H.*, IV, pp. 157-8.

<sup>6</sup> Herodotus, V, 73.

the responsibility for sending the embassy. Similarly with Panhellenism at this time: it is not to be identified with the anti-Persian nationalism of Isocrates. It is true that the nobles of the sixth and early fifth centuries were more "panhellenic" than the masses; but this does not mean that they were in favour of a national front against Persia, but that, chiefly owing to their greater wealth and opportunities, they were less confined to their own states and had a wider social, though hardly a wider political, outlook. The best representatives of Panhellenism were Simonides, as ready to celebrate the pro-Persian Aleuadae as the heroes of Thermopylae and Salamis, and Pindar. Miltiades, it is true, was both panhellenic in this sense and a national leader against Persia in 490; but the combination in him was accidental, the result of external circumstances.

2) We should not fill in the outlines of the history of this period with picturesque detail. For the embassy to Sardes, for example, it is legitimate to surmise that Herodotus' story is not only incomplete but to some degree tendentious: that it is a defence, and a not very successful defence, of the Alcmeonidae. But if it is, it is a defence against charges (irrelevant charges) brought in the middle of the fifth century in regard to actions two generations earlier, in order to discredit Pericles, not part of the Alcmeonid "tradition" dating from the end of the sixth century. It is in fact on all fours with the defence of the Alcmeonidae in the Marathon shield episode: it has been pointed out more than once that, quite apart from the facts, it cannot have been generally believed in Athens in the winter of 490/89 that the Alcmeonidae had been guilty of treachery in the battle, or they would not have been in a position to attack Miltiades successfully the following summer.<sup>7</sup> Herodotus' defence of them is once more a defence against charges made much later. If, therefore, we accept it as probable that Cleisthenes was responsible for the embassy and that Herodotus' way of telling the story should be ignored, we must stop there, and be content with our negative knowledge that the embassy was a failure, that no treaty was made with Persia, and that Athens, whether by decision of the demos or of the governing class with the backing of public

<sup>7</sup> Always assuming that Xanthippus, in attacking Miltiades, was acting as head of the clan; see below.



opinion or of a ruling clique, did not, after the overthrow of the tyrants, give earth and water to the King.

Or take a more important matter, the career of Themistocles. The most remarkable thing about this is the gap in the story between the archonship in 493/2 and the shipbuilding activity ten years later; apart from a couple of references in Plutarch to his brave fighting at Marathon in rivalry with Aristides,<sup>8</sup> and to his envy of Miltiades' success,<sup>9</sup> and the very dubious statement of Stesimbrotus that his naval programme was carried out in opposition to Miltiades,<sup>10</sup> nothing is recorded or even invented for this period, so important both for himself and for Athens. By a strict interpretation of the evidence we must believe that after attaining the highest position in the state in 493, and making a beginning with his naval programme,<sup>11</sup> he dropped completely out of sight for a decade. This is sufficiently remarkable in itself, in a man of such a character, and one about whom stories so readily grew; when we add to it Herodotus' statement that he had but lately come to the front in 480,<sup>12</sup> and the fact that the archonship does not occur in the biographical tradition but only as a date in Dionysius' *Roman Antiquities*, I am inclined for my part to doubt the archonship and to put Themistocles' rise in the 80's rather than the 90's.<sup>13</sup> Whether, however, that is correct or no, what modern scholarship has done, in happy

<sup>8</sup> Plutarch, *Aristides*, 5, 4, not in *Themistocles*.

<sup>9</sup> *Idem*, *Themistocles*, 3, 4.

<sup>11</sup> Thucydides, I, 93, 3.

<sup>10</sup> *Idem*, *Themistocles*, 4, 5.

<sup>12</sup> Herodotus, VII, 143, 1.

<sup>13</sup> With the consequence that Thucydides' *τῆς ἐκείνου ἀρχῆς ἥς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν Ἀθηναῖοις ἤρξε* (I, 93, 3) refers to some other office, for example that of *ἐπιμελητῆς τῶν νεωρίων*, which Themistocles will have held, probably for more than one year from 483 or 484; and that, if it is correct that he was a member of the Areopagus (*Ἀθ. Πολ.*, 25, 3), he must have held one of the other, politically unimportant, archonships. I am not forgetting another possibility: with the exception of Hipparchus, Themistocles, and Aristides, the eponymous archons from 506 to 488 are as unknown as those chosen later after the substitution of the lot for the vote in the election; it is possible that the office had already lost its political importance—hence Miltiades did not become archon, nor even polemarch, after his triumphant return to Athens—and that Themistocles' archonship, therefore, does not prove any political victory for him; and his rise to power will still have taken place in the 80's and Thucydides will refer to another office. Even so, the omission of the archonship in the biography is unexplained.

disregard of the enormity of the offence, is to fill up with a purely conjectural life the gap left in their knowledge by ancient writers. The conjectures vary greatly in plausibility, from Beloch's, that Themistocles was during this period, as throughout his life, the leader of the aristocrats (if he was not of the tyrants' party, he was the bitter enemy of the Alcmeonidae; therefore he was of the aristocratic party), to the far more probable view of McGregor and others that he managed to oust the Alcmeonidae from the leadership of the democrats, joined up with Miltiades in the crisis of Marathon, and later, after the temporary reverse owing to the failure of the Paros expedition, succeeded in getting rid of all his rivals by ostracism and was thus preëminent in 483. A possible enough story; but it is conjecture only, and it still remains to explain the disappearance of it all from the tradition.<sup>14</sup>

3) One more point. We habitually speak of the Alcmeonidae as of a family so close-knit that every member of it, and everyone connected with it, must be a member of the same party and all always work together. Thus Xanthippus' prosecution of Miltiades in 489 is taken to prove either the recovery of the Alcmeonidae from the disgrace of the previous year, or that there had been no disgrace; the prosecution of Themistocles *ca.* 470 by Leobotes son of Alcmeon is proof that the former and the Alcmeonidae had always been enemies (Beloch's view): even Aristides must be brought within the family circle so that his archonship in 489, in spite of the part he had played at Marathon, may be in keeping with the family triumph. This kind of argument is due to

<sup>14</sup> I do not follow the argument, supported by Walker, *C. A. H.*, IV, p. 266, and Robinson, that the change in the position of the archons, also attributed by them to Themistocles, made possible, and was intended to make possible, "the rule of one man." The chief archonship, in the right hands, could be much more powerful than membership in the board of ten strategoi, even though a man might be several times strategos, and on occasion and for a particular purpose might be given precedence over one or more of his colleagues. The change in the political value of the archonship meant a weakening of the Areopagus. A *strategos autokrator* did not hold a particular post, but was a strategos given special powers for a special purpose, just as an ambassador might be, to decide the number of troops required for an expedition or to conclude an agreement with another state without further reference to the ecclesia.

an unintelligent adoption of Herodotus' language in his accounts of the overthrow of the tyranny and of the shield episode (because of the polemics of 450-430 B. C.); yet there is little evidence for it. Aristotle says that in the 80's Megacles was of the tyrants' party and that Xanthippus was not, and, though the value of this statement is doubtful, it cannot be simply ignored; and Cimon was as closely connected by marriage with the Alcmeonidae as Xanthippus. Though the later attacks on the Alcmeonidae were aimed at Pericles, there is no reason to suppose that *he* carried the whole family with him in his political career; and it is wrong to assume without further proof a more closely knit organization a generation earlier.

These preliminaries over, we can get a closer grip of the problem if we keep in mind one fact, which is commonly ignored, though McGregor states it clearly: that Greek tyrants, at least of the seventh and sixth centuries, rested on popular support, that the aristocrats were their normal enemies, and that this was as true in Athens as elsewhere; that therefore the democrats after 510 were in the main of the same party, or group of people, as had once supported the tyranny, and Cleisthenes as head of the party was a successor of the Peisistratidae. It is true there were exceptional features in the Athenian story: it was exceptional for a tyrant, and still more for his successor, to secure the co-operation of so many of the aristocrats; and above all it was exceptional for a democracy to succeed to a tyranny. These were due in large measure to the personal characters of Peisistratus and Hippias; and one result was that not only had Hippias friends in both parties, but, when the crisis came, owing to the embittered last few years of his rule, the democrats were ready to stand on their own feet, and, once the tyrant had been expelled, to dispense with his or any successor's protection against the aristocrats. Cleisthenes' decision to go over to the democrats made their success certain; but in the main we can say with McGregor, "tyranny had rendered its service to the young city; politically Athens had grown up." These exceptional features, however, must not blind us to the fact that by and large the Athenian story is normal: the rich, always disliking a strong central power, had been the enemies of the tyrants (as shown most clearly in the Leipsydrium and Cedon skolia) and the poor had

supported and been supported by them. We need not therefore say, with Wade-Gery,<sup>15</sup> that since 545 the Areopagus had been packed by the tyrants, and "this explains (what indeed needs explaining) why the Areopagus made no trouble about admitting the Laws of Kleisthenes to the Statute book; the Areopagus at that moment was a packed body, whose members were discredited." It was packed largely with men who now followed Cleisthenes. (What needs explaining in the history of this body is why it apparently played no part in 632, 594, 582, or 560-546, when it was an aristocratic body, and should have been powerful.) From this we can assume, in the absence of special evidence, that Cleisthenes and Hipparchus, son of Charmos, were both of them, after Hippias had been expelled, prominent leaders of the democrats against the attempt of Cleomenes and Isagoras to set up oligarchic rule; and that Hipparchus' archonship in 496 does not necessarily indicate any change either in the balance of parties or in Athenian policy about this time. We are right of course in assuming considerable debate in Athens about sending help to Ionia. I agree with those who think that the small number of ships sent was probably the result of a compromise, and that the withdrawal at the end of the first campaign was due to a desire to be quit of the whole affair and so to avoid, if possible, a direct conflict with Persia. But we are not entitled to identify the arguments and hesitations with particular parties. Some may well have argued, "it is madness to anger Persia by supporting the Ionians"; others again, "we must do all we can to help our fellow Greeks and at the same time prevent now and for always a Persian domination of all Greece"; others again, "we must do something, but with Aegina threatening us in the Saronic Gulf, we cannot send more than twenty triremes." But we have no reason whatever for assuming a "tyrants' party" in Athens who used the first argument because Hippias had taken refuge in Persia, or that it must have been the panhellenic aristocrats who used the second. The differences of opinion may have been of individuals, not of parties; and the subsequent decision to withdraw is as likely as not to have been due to the timidity or the disillusionment of all. That is to say, I do not accept

<sup>15</sup> H. T. Wade-Gery, *C. Q.*, XXV (1931), p. 81.



the argument as it is put, for example by McGregor: "there still resided in Athens members of the Peisistratid house, and if one or more of these should hold the chief magistracy, the city could support her claim that no oppression of Persia's friends in Athens existed." Hipparchus stayed on in Athens and was elected archon because he was with the democrats, not because he was a relation of Hippias. There were *two* parties or groups in Athens ("right and left," "rich and poor," or "oligarchs and democrats"), not three.

I must here interpolate a word about the younger Peisistratus, son of Hippias. Meritt has recently argued that he too remained in Athens after 510, and that his archonship should be placed *ca.* 500, and probably in the year before that of Hipparchus son of Charmos, both being evidence of the same movement away from support to Ionia, and towards friendship with Persia through Hippias' party in Athens.<sup>16</sup> This has been accepted by McGregor among others. Meritt says that the famous inscription on the altar to Pythian Apollo seen by Thucydides,<sup>17</sup> from its lettering, is not earlier than 511, and that the ostrakon with the name of Peisistratus shows that Hippias' son was still in Athens after 487. This cannot be accepted. 1) With all deference to the epigraphists, we do not yet know enough about early Attic inscriptions to be able to date them thus finely; and Meritt is compelled by his argument to assume that the Hipparchus, son of Peisistratus, who made a dedication at Ptoon at about the same time, to judge from the lettering, that the altar to Apollo was dedicated by Peisistratus in Athens, must be, not the tyrant's brother who was killed in 514, but another, very likely the son of this younger Peisistratus. This is very far-fetched. 2) It is too much to ask us to believe that the prominent position taken on this hypothesis by Hippias' son in the fifteen years or so after 500 left no trace in the tradition, that he was not suspected of Medism at Marathon, and that, though his name was put for selection, he was not ostracized in the 80's. It is easier to believe that the ostrakon bears the name of another Peisistratus. 3) Thucydides quite definitely implies both that the younger Peisi-

<sup>16</sup> B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia*, VIII (1939), pp. 62-5.

<sup>17</sup> Thucydides, VI, 54, 7; *I. G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 761 = M. N. Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, 8 = J. Kirchner, *Imagines*, 11.

stratus' archonship was during the tyranny, αἰεί τινα ἐπεμέλοντο σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς εἶναι. καὶ ἄλλοι τε αὐτῶν ἤρξαν τὴν ἐνιαύσιον Ἀθηναίους ἀρχὴν καὶ Πεισίστρατος ὁ Ἰππίου τοῦ τυραννέσαντος υἱός,<sup>18</sup> and that the sons of Hippias were expelled in 510, ἡ στήλη περὶ τῆς τῶν τυράννων ἀδικίας ἣ ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων ἀκροπόλει σταθεῖσα, ἐν ᾗ Θεσσαλὸν μὲν οὐδ' Ἰππάρχον οὐδεὶς παῖς γέγραπται, Ἰππίου δὲ πέντε,<sup>19</sup> . . . 4) For what it is worth, Marcellinus<sup>20</sup> says that, after the defeat in Sicily, Athens recalled her exiles πλὴν τῶν Πεισι-στρατιδῶν. This would be a renewal of an old decree, as of that of 480, and would show that the direct descendants of the tyrants had all been condemned to perpetual exile. But there may not be anything in this: no one else seems to have recorded an amnesty to exiles in 413, and if "after the defeat in Sicily" is a mistake for Aegospotami, as is probable, our other authorities who mention the recall of the exiles in 404 do not add the exception.<sup>21</sup>

Nothing that has been said above is to be taken as meaning that there were no "friends of the tyrants" in Athens after 510; doubtless there were individuals who had suffered from the overthrow of the tyranny and hoped for restitution if Hippias returned, and others who may have sincerely believed, even after the successes of 506, that the masses needed a strong protecting hand and had no trust in Cleisthenes, who might any day rejoin his aristocratic friends. But this is very different from a "tyrants' party," allied with the democrats, at least from time to time, and *ex hypothesi* friendly to both Hippias and Persia. There may have been, for instance, one who said to himself "Hippias has put himself out of court by the last years of his rule and by his flight to Persia; but I know someone who would make a very good successor." Such a one would not be favourable to Hippias. Nor have I said anything inconsistent with the statement in Aristotle that the device of ostracism was originally aimed by Cleisthenes at would-be tyrants and at Hipparchus in particular. Hipparchus was a rival leader of the democrats; Cleisthenes may well have regarded him as an obstacle to his own ambition to be the first man in Athens, or have honestly thought that, if he became too powerful as democratic leader, he would, like Peisi-

<sup>18</sup> Thucydides, VI, 54, 6.

<sup>19</sup> *Idem*, VI, 55, 1.

<sup>20</sup> Marcellinus, *Περὶ τοῦ βίου Θεουκλίδου*, 32.

<sup>21</sup> Plutarch, *Lysander*, 14, 7; *Andocides*, III, 11, 31.

stratus, make himself tyrant. The Athenians may have been *πρῶτοι* to the tyrants' kindred, but that did not prevent them from being suspicious as well, then, as afterwards.

The orthodox view that Miltiades, on his return to Athens in 493, put himself at the head of the nobles, is probable enough; but his own career shows as well as anything that it is wrong to label his party or the individuals in it as consistently anti-Persian or pro-Spartan, or even always opposed to the tyranny. There is good reason to suppose some coöperation between Peisistratus and the elder Miltiades in the first settlement in the Chersonese, and I cannot believe in continual hostility between the younger Miltiades and Hippias at Sigeum, such as Berve asserts.<sup>22</sup> Miltiades was archon in 524 (Cleisthenes in 523), soon after Hippias' succession.<sup>23</sup> He was practically a vassal of Persia and on good terms with the satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia for some years. All this did not prevent him from leading the nobles in 493, nor from being whole-heartedly patriotic in 490. Nor should we be surprised at this, or assume that he was of changeable or unscrupulous character. In the same way, while the great majority of Athenians were united for resistance in 490, there were naturally some who were timid and would have surrendered without a struggle; doubtless many others were cautious and favoured awaiting the blow in Athens rather than marching to Marathon (indeed it is arguable that only success justified the bolder policy, as with Themistocles' strategy at Salamis; certainly Miltiades could not have been afraid of any treacherous move in the city); but there is no reason to suppose that the division of opinion was on party lines.

<sup>22</sup> I also think V. Ehrenberg, *Eunomia*, I, 1939 (see *J. H. S.*, LIX, pp. 294-5), is right against Berve, who maintains that the various Athenian settlements in the Hellespont region were not only not all steps in a steady imperialist or expansionist policy (with which we can agree), but isolated colonies led by individual nobles in which the state had no part; and that land hunger was the only motive of the settlers. There was more to it than this; and the Chersonese was not the best region in the Mediterranean for those in search of good land. Certainly the trade that passed through the Straits must have been the main motive of settlement (whether the Athenians were themselves traders or ministered to others), and it is not probable that it was accident that led both Miltiades and Hippias to the same region.

<sup>23</sup> B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia*, loc. cit.

The tradition about the period from 510 to 483 is, in fact, both consistent and credible, provided we do not try to fill too many of the details by the help of imaginations inspired by conventional views of party politics.<sup>24</sup> There are only two statements, both in the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*, that at first sight seem difficult to fit in: the first, that Isagoras was a friend of the tyrants,<sup>25</sup> though he appears quite naturally to take the lead against them, as one would expect an aristocrat to do; the second that Megacles was ostracized in 486 as a member of the tyrants' party.<sup>26</sup> It is quite likely that Isagoras had been one of the nobles who had coöperated with Hippias, and had perhaps not deserted him till the invasion of Cleomenes; but there is no reason why Aristotle should not have expressed this clearly, and perhaps he was using the language common at a later time, when, owing to the successful establishment of the democracy, the enemy of democracy was automatically taken to be friendly to tyranny—e. g. Alcibiades at Sparta in 414, τοῖς γὰρ τυράννοις αἰεί ποτε διάφοροί ἐσμεν (πᾶν δὲ τὸ ἐναντιούμενον τῷ δυναστεύοντι δῆμος ὠνόμασται), καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου ξυμπαρέμεινεν ἡ προστασία ἡμῶν τοῦ πλήθους,<sup>27</sup> and Thucydides more generally, after his digression on the overthrow of the tyrants, ὃν ἐνθυμούμενος ὁ δῆμος . . . πάντα αὐτοῖς ἐδόκει ἐπὶ ξυνωμοσίᾳ ὀλιγαρχικῇ καὶ τυραννικῇ πεπραῆχθαι;<sup>28</sup> and in consequence anyone opposed to the demos in 510 may be labelled φίλος τῶν τυράννων. As to Megacles, those who accept Alcmeonid treachery at Marathon and explain it as agreement with the tyranny find no difficulty; yet it will not do, for equally explicitly, Aristotle says that Xanthippus, who according to the usual view "led the Alcmeonidae" in the prosecution of Miltiades in 489, was not of the tyrants' party.<sup>29</sup> Once more we must think of individuals, not of parties. Megacles (but not "the Alcmeonidae") may have been recently acting with Hipparchus, and so shared the label; he may even have played no very glorious

<sup>24</sup> In an excellent note, *Miltiades*, p. 68, Berve expresses the right principles; but he is as far from following them as those whom he criticizes. Cf., for example, his treatment of the evidence of Herodotus for the embassy to Sardes (p. 71), and for the Parian expedition (pp. 95-7).

<sup>25</sup> Aristotle, *Ἀθ. Πολ.*, 20, 1.

<sup>26</sup> Aristotle, *op. cit.*, 22, 5-6.

<sup>27</sup> Thucydides, VI, 89, 4.

<sup>28</sup> *Idem*, VI, 60, 1.

<sup>29</sup> Aristotle, *op. cit.*, 22, 6.



part at Marathon. But we need not guess; we need only remember what was the aim and object of ostracism—which was *not* to crush a party.

## 2. The Treaty of Callias.

In a learned and attractive article in *Athenian Studies*, Wade-Gery<sup>30</sup> examines minutely and fits together the few fragments of evidence that we possess about the Treaty of Callias, and comes to conclusions about its terms and its historical significance which deserve careful examination. I am not convinced by its ingenuities and I find its attractions delusive.

1) By a comparison of inscriptions, Wade-Gery argues that the treaty of undying friendship with the Great King which Andocides says (III, 29) was negotiated by his uncle Epilycus is the same as the treaty with the king mentioned in *I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 8; and that it can be satisfactorily dated to 424/3, the first year of the reign of Darius II. An Epilycus was bouleutes in that year and he may have been Andocides' uncle.

2) Theopompus, as is well known, denied the genuineness of the inscription containing the treaty,<sup>31</sup> because the alphabet was Ionic. Theon speaks of the treaty as with Darius, αἱ πρὸς βασιλέα Δαρείον Ἀθηναίων † πρὸς Ἑλλήνας † συνθηκαί. This may well be correct; for (1) a treaty in the first year of a new reign is as likely as not to have been but the renewal of an older one, in this case of the treaty of 449 with Artaxerxes; and (2) an Athenian public document of 424/3 in the Ionic alphabet would not be very unusual,<sup>32</sup> while one of 449 would be surprising. Moreover, if the treaty of Andocides and of *I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 8, was but a renewal in 424/3 of the treaty of 449, it is easier to understand the omission of all reference to it in Thucydides. As Wade-Gery says, this omission is the more surprising because Thucydides records the abortive embassy of the year before, which returned home on getting news of the death of Artaxerxes; but he may have passed over a treaty which was only a formality.

<sup>30</sup> H. T. Wade-Gery, *Athenian Studies presented to W. S. Ferguson, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Suppl. I (1940), pp. 121-54.

<sup>31</sup> F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, II (Berlin, 1923-30), 115 F 153 (from Theon and Harpocration).

<sup>32</sup> Cf. *I. G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 25.

3) Isocrates in his *Panegyricus*,<sup>33</sup> published in 380 B.C., wrote of the great deterioration in Greek affairs consequent on the fall of the Athenian Empire: *μάλιστα δ' ἂν τις συνίδοι τὸ μέγεθος τῆς μεταβολῆς εἰ παραναγνοίῃ τὰς συνθήκας τὰς τ' ἐφ' ἡμῶν γενομένας καὶ τὰς νῦν ἀναγεγραμμένας. τότε μὲν γὰρ ἡμεῖς φανησόμεθα τὴν ἀρχὴν τὴν Βασιλέως ὀρίζοντες καὶ τῶν φόρων ἐνίους τάττοντες καὶ κωλύοντες αὐτὸν τῇ θαλάττῃ χρῆσθαι· νῦν δὲ ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ὁ διοικῶν τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ προστάτων ἅ χρὴ ποιεῖν ἐκάστους, καὶ μόνον οὐκ ἐπιστάθμους ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι καθιστάς.* By τῶν φόρων ἐνίους τάττοντες, according to Wade-Gery, Isocrates was referring to one of the clauses of the treaty, by which Athens stipulated the amounts of tribute to be paid by the Greek cities of Asia (which were in the Delian League) to Persia. This view, he says, is supported by Herodotus and Thucydides: "whether 'the treaty made in our time' . . . is the treaty with Artaxerxes or with Dareios, is not clear"; but it matters little, for "Herodotus implies such a clause for the Artaxerxes treaty (VI 42. 2), Thucydides for the Dareios treaty (VIII 5. 5)."

4) This consideration affects our estimate of the position of Athens in relation both to Persia and to the subject-allies after Cimon's last campaign and right up to the time of the Ionian war of 413. Wade-Gery now takes, in my opinion, a much more reasonable view of the political significance of the treaty than he did in his earlier article,<sup>34</sup> but he can still say: "In the freshness of his indignation Isokrates lets out the treaty's most disreputable clause. . . . It is never mentioned again."

As to the first argument, Wade-Gery makes a good case; at the same time it must be remembered that in part it depends on the identification of the Neocleides who was the epistates mentioned in *I. G.*, II<sup>2</sup>, 8, and the Neocleides who was first secretary in 424/3, in *I. G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 87, for if this identification fails, we know nothing about the contents or the date of the treaty mentioned in the former inscription. I am also not confident of the identification of Epilycus, though it was an uncommon name; for I doubt whether an Athenian was ever sent as ambassador during his year of office as bouleutes.<sup>35</sup> But Wade-Gery knows the inscriptions better than I do, and he may be right. Certainly

<sup>33</sup> Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, 120.

<sup>34</sup> H. T. Wade-Gery, *J. H. S.*, LIII (1933), p. 87.

<sup>35</sup> Andocides' uncle may have been one of the aristocratic ambassadors ridiculed by Aristophanes in the *Acharnians*.

by his interpretation of this part of the evidence Thucydides' silence, strange anyhow, is best explained.

The second argument also is ingenious; but why should Theopompus mention a treaty with Darius? For all his rhetoric and his shallow thinking, he was a learned man, and he must have known that a statement about a treaty with Darius II, as such, was no evidence against one with Artaxerxes, and that Darius can have had nothing to do with a peace made a quarter of a century before he began to reign. Wade-Gery postulates the epigraphic possibilities which confronted Theopompus: (1) the stele contained only the treaty with Artaxerxes inscribed in 449/8 with a new headline inscribed *in rasura* in 424/3, the latter only being in Ionic script;<sup>36</sup> (2) it contained the earlier treaty on one face, that with Darius on the other, the latter being in Ionic; (3) it contained only the treaty of 423; and (4) it contained both treaties or only the later one, but in a copy made after 403 B. C.,<sup>37</sup> of course in Ionic script. In no case, however, do I see Theopompus making such a mistake as Wade-Gery supposes, nor, if he did, Callisthenes following him.<sup>38</sup> Since the text of Theon in this passage is anyhow corrupt, it is easier to suppose that the mention of Darius is a mistake by Theon or the copyist.

It is, however, about the third argument, the statement of Isocrates, said to be supported by Herodotus and Thucydides, that the doubts are gravest. I cannot believe that Isocrates or anybody else would write τῶν φόρων ἐνίους τάττοντες, to express

<sup>36</sup> Cf. *I. G.*, I<sup>2</sup>, 51, 52 = M. N. Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, 57, 58. It is perhaps just worth while to note, as we must use him for evidence, that Andocides says that the treaty which his uncle negotiated was "for all time." If that was true, it cannot have been only a renewal of the old; for if that had been for all time, there would have been no need for a renewal on the accession of Darius, as Wade-Gery elsewhere notes. But it would of course be characteristic of Andocides to exaggerate in this way.

<sup>37</sup> Wade-Gery says in 380; but it can hardly have been so late as that, to judge from Isocrates' comparison of the fifth century treaty with τὰς νῦν ἀναγεγραμμένας.

<sup>38</sup> I agree with Wade-Gery that Callisthenes probably accepted Theopompus' argument (he may have known little about Attic inscriptions or the details of Athenian history), but qualified it with the statement, reported by Plutarch, *Cimon*, 13, 4, that since the Eurymedon, Persia in effect observed the terms of the supposed treaty.

the meaning "assessing some of the tributes payable by Greek states to the King," omitting the words necessary to make the meaning clear. To an Athenian or a Greek audience, I feel sure, τῶν φόρων can refer only to the tributes paid by Greek states to Athens. If we say that he is being sly, purposely obscure, why did he make any reference at all to a clause which everybody else managed to evade? And how can we use such obscurity as evidence? Nor do I believe that Isocrates, whether in boyish enthusiasm or in fresh indignation (he was 55 when he wrote the *Panegyricus*), "let out" a sort of secret clause which was there for anybody who wished to read on the stone. If we look at the passage, we see that he is not recording *clauses* of the treaty at all, any more than those of the treaty of 386, but its general effects and the political conditions of the time. I do not myself doubt that Isocrates is referring to what Thucydides describes in the words ἔταξαν ἄς τε εἶδει παρέχειν τῶν πόλεων χρήματα πρὸς τὸν βάρβαρον καὶ ἄς ναῦς;<sup>39</sup> and though with this meaning also he is vague and inaccurate (τοὺς φόρους ἐνίοις τάττοντες would be natural, and this assessment belongs to 477, not to 449), we fortunately do not have to rely upon it as evidence for the historical fact. Even if Isocrates means tribute paid to Persia, it would not follow that it is tribute paid by members of the Delian League; he will mean rather that Athens determined the relations between some Asiatic princes, of Caria or Lycia, and the King, just as (he asserts) the latter determined those of the Greek states by the treaty of 386. We have after all other evidence for the clauses of the treaty of Callias (whether the stele was a forgery or not), that of Ephorus as recorded, quite soberly, by Diodorus,<sup>40</sup> not to mention Isocrates elsewhere;<sup>41</sup> and in this matter, Ephorus is a better authority than a vague statement in a highly rhetorical passage of his master.

But Isocrates is supported by Herodotus and Thucydides? Let us look at the historical context. Wade-Gery<sup>42</sup> notes that the treaty, by his interpretation of its "most disreputable clause,"

<sup>39</sup> Thucydides, I, 96, 1.

<sup>40</sup> Diodorus, XII, 4, 5.

<sup>41</sup> So anxious is Wade-Gery to use every scrap of evidence that he can believe Isocrates' statements that by the treaty the King's armies were not to cross the river Halys (VII, 80, and XII, 59), and gives an elaborate explanation. But I cannot follow him.

<sup>42</sup> H. T. Wade-Gery, *Harv. Stud. Cl. Phil.*, Suppl. I (1940), pp. 143-44.



must have been subjected to considerable strain by many incidents between 448 and 424, such as the Samian war, the trouble at Colophon and Notion in 430,<sup>43</sup> especially the Athenian settlement there (*κατὰ τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νόμους κατόκισαν τὸ Νότιον*), the *ἀργυρολόγοι νῆες* sent to Caria and Lycia,<sup>44</sup> and the "grave provocation of the Tribute assessment of 425, which not only trebled Athens' claims on the Ionian coast, but included places far beyond the neutral zone. . . . It was no doubt to explain these matters that the embassy recorded by Thucydides, IV 50. 3, set out for Sousa in the winter of 425/4, but turned back on the news of Artaxerxes' death. A year later, in 424/3, when Dareios II had disposed of his rivals, the treaty was renewed with him." By a more ordinary interpretation of the treaty only the Colophon-Notion incident should have caused serious strain (for the Persians after all did nothing to help Samos in 441/0), and Athenian embassies to Persia may have been sent to receive an explanation of this as much as to give one of their own actions; but I agree that if Wade-Gery's interpretation is correct, Athens had in effect broken the fourth clause of the treaty, as that is given in Diodorus: *μὴ στρατεύειν Ἀθηναίους εἰς τὴν χώραν ἧς βασιλεὺς Ἀρταξέρξης ἀρχεῖ*.<sup>45</sup> Be that, however, as it may, there are more important considerations. First, Thucydides seems to have been unaware that these actions by Athens broke, or at least put a great strain upon, the terms of the existing treaty; <sup>46</sup> second, if there had been all this strain, all these provocations, especially the most serious and most recent of them, the reassessment of 425, the treaty of 423 can have been no ordinary renewal, but either Darius must have accepted the, so to speak, Athenian interpretation of the treaty with Artaxerxes, or Athens must have promised to draw in her horns. In either case, the renewal

<sup>43</sup> Thucydides, III, 34.

<sup>44</sup> *Idem*, II, 69; III, 19.

<sup>45</sup> Presumably either *βασιλεὺς* or *Ἀρταξέρξης* should be bracketed.

<sup>46</sup> Wade-Gery betrays a certain uneasiness by his use here of the phrase "a serious strain"; Athens must have openly violated the treaty, as Wade-Gery has in effect said on a previous page (142), where he states that the Aegean coast was the limit of the Persian territory which Athens had agreed not to attack. He thinks that Thucydides' words *ἐκ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἀρχῆς* (VIII, 5, 5), and *παραπλεῖν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γῆν* (VIII, 56, 4), show not only the King's claims that the Greek cities belonged to him but Athenian recognition of them in 449 and 423. What then of another demand which Alcibiades says the King made as a price of his help, *Ἰωνίαν πᾶσαν ἡξίον δίδοσθαι*?

of the treaty was an important political act, and Thucydides' silence about it ceases to be explicable.

In 413 Tissaphernes was ready to help Sparta against Athens; ὑπὸ βασιλείῳ γὰρ νεωστὶ ἐτύγχανε πεπραγμένος τοὺς ἐκ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἀρχῆς φόρους, οὓς δι' Ἀθηναίους ἀπὸ τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων οὐ δυνάμενος πρᾶσσεσθαι ἐπωφείλησεν.<sup>47</sup> Wade-Gery says that this means that Darius II exacted (not merely demanded) all arrears of tribute from Tissaphernes; and, since the latter could not conceivably have paid all arrears from 449, or even from 423, the first year of the new reign and the year of the new treaty, there must have been a recent event, an Athenian repudiation of the treaty, as a result of which the Greek cities of Ionia no longer paid their tribute to the King.<sup>48</sup> This event he thinks may have been the Athenian alliance with Amorges, probably in 414.<sup>49</sup> Again, however, this is to suppose that Thucydides could pass over in silence an action by Athens which was decisive for her relations with Persia, this time in a context where those relations are the main theme; indeed the only reference he makes to any Athenian help to Amorges is at VIII, 54, 3, where he says that Peisandrus accused Phrynichus of betraying Iasos, which had been held by Amorges (VIII, 28). At the very least, a little previous to this passage, in VIII, 5, 5, he must have written, τότε οὐ δυνάμενος πρᾶσσεσθαι, if not τότε πρῶτον. Wade-Gery refers to Dundas' note in *C. R.*, XLVIII (1934), pp. 167-8, but not to his argument that ἐπωφείλησεν does not necessarily mean that *arrears* of debt were exacted from Tissaphernes, nor to his sensible suggestion that if they were, they were probably those accumulated since his own appointment as satrap (the year of which is unknown, but need not have been long before 413). There is in fact nothing whatever in Thucydides even to suggest that the cities of Ionia paid tribute to Persia during the Peloponnesian

<sup>47</sup> Thucydides, VIII, 5, 5.

<sup>48</sup> I have used the term "Ionia" for all the cities of the Aegean coast. I do not know if Wade-Gery thinks that the Hellespontine cities paid tribute to Persia after 449. Pharnabazus' conduct in 413 was similar to Tissaphernes', trying for the help of Sparta to induce the cities to revolt διὰ τοὺς φόρους (Thucydides, VIII, 6, 1). They also are said to be ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἀρχῇ.

<sup>49</sup> Andocides, III, 29. Wade-Gery says that Athens supported him *officially*. This is a lot to get out of Andocides and Thucydides, VIII, 54, 3.

war; and the passage, Ἰωνίαν πᾶσαν ἡξίου δίδοσθαι,<sup>50</sup> is irreconcilable with the view that they were, by the treaties of 449 and 423, recognized to be within the dominions of the King.

Lastly, one must consider Herodotus, VI, 42, 2: (Ἀρταφρένης) καὶ τὰς χώρας σφέων μετρήσας κατὰ παρασάγγας, . . . φόρους ἔταξε ἐκάστοισι, οἳ κατὰ χώραν διατελέουσι ἔχοντες ἐκ τούτου τοῦ χρόνου αἰεὶ ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ὡς ἐτάχθησαν ἐξ Ἀρταφρένεος· ἐτάχθησαν δὲ σχεδὸν κατὰ ταῦτα τὰ καὶ πρότερον εἶχον. When Wade-Gery writes that Tisaphernes could not have collected arrears of tribute owing to the King from 449, it means presumably that he does not even contemplate the possibility that any tribute could have been owing from before that date, from 478 in fact; and though, I think, he nowhere says so expressly, it seems clear that he regards this tribute of Ionia to the King as agreed, for the first time, in the treaty of Callias. It is indeed difficult to envisage the situation if the Ionians were paying tribute from 478 onwards. They revolted from Persia in 479/8; they took part in the campaigns of the Hellespont, of the Eurymedon, and in Egypt; there was Athenian interference and there were Athenian garrisons and magistrates in some of the cities. All this we know from the unimpeachable evidence of Herodotus, Thucydides, and inscriptions. If the Ionians at any time while the Delian League lasted paid tribute to Persia, it must have been only after 449, as Wade-Gery implies. What then becomes of Herodotus' evidence at VI, 42, 2, which, if it says anything about Ionian tribute to Persia, says that it was paid continuously from 493? The one thing that is quite clear is that it does *not* "imply such a clause ('Athens agrees that the cities of Asia shall pay such and such tribute to the King') for the Artaxerxes treaty."<sup>51</sup> This passage in Herodotus is a problem which has not yet been solved. I have discussed it elsewhere,<sup>52</sup> and I still believe that there is something wrong with the text, and that the interpretation of it which makes it say that Ionia paid tribute to Persia after the revolt of 478 as before is inconsistent with the historical fact

<sup>50</sup> Thucydides, VIII, 56, 4.

<sup>51</sup> I presume Wade-Gery would maintain that another clause in the treaty stipulated for the withdrawal of these Athenian garrisons and magistrates. Compare the Persian proposals to Sparta in 397 (Xenophon, *Hell.*, III, 2, 20).

<sup>52</sup> A. W. Gomme, *C. Q.*, XX (1926), pp. 97-8.

which Herodotus must have known. But, however that may be, it does not support Wade-Gery's view of the treaty of 449.

Moreover, there are some other questions which the historian is bound to ask himself. How did it happen that Isocrates alone divulged a clause in a treaty that was there for all to see? Why was the clause "never mentioned again"? Why did Theopompus, in a passage in which he was pointing out the falsehood of many Athenian claims (there was no Greek oath before the battle of Plataea, Marathon was not *οἶαν ἅπαντες ὑμνοῦσι γεγενημένην, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα, φησίν, ἢ Ἀθηναίων πόλις ἀλαζονεύεται καὶ παρακρούεται τοὺς Ἕλληνας*)—why did he take the trouble to prove that the treaty was a forgery, instead of pointing out its inglorious terms? Why in fact did none of Athens' enemies ever notice the disreputable clause? And how came Callisthenes<sup>53</sup> to say "while accepting Theopompus' argument that the treaty itself is a forgery, yet I must point out that Persia was in fact compelled to observe its supposed terms," when these terms involved for Athens an inglorious retreat?

Diodorus gives one of the terms of the treaty of 449 as follows: *αὐτονόμους εἶναι τὰς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις ἀπάσας*. In 397/6 Agesilaus of Sparta proposed terms of peace to Tissaphernes: <sup>54</sup> *αὐτονόμους καὶ τὰς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ πόλεις εἶναι, ὥσπερ καὶ τὰς ἐν τῇ παρ' ἡμῖν Ἑλλάδι*. "These are victor's terms," says Wade-Gery,<sup>55</sup> "... They are far worse, for Persia, than the peace of Kallias had been. Tissaphernes' successor, Tithraustes, states the King's counter-proposal: it is a compromise between the utter complaisance of Sparta in 412, and her utter defiance now: it is, in fact, the Kallias treaty (*ib.* III 4. 25): *βασιλεὺς δὲ ἀξιοῖ σὲ μὲν ἀποπλεῖν οἴκαδε, τὰς δ' ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ πόλεις αὐτονόμους οὕσας τὸν ἀρχαῖον δασμὸν αὐτῷ ἀποφέρειν*." It is, to put it mildly, a remarkable thing to assume that Diodorus' words are the equivalent of Tithraustes' terms rather than those of Agesilaus, to ignore both the words *τὸν ἀρχαῖον δασμὸν αὐτῷ ἀποφέρειν* and the fact that Diodorus includes the clause among *the concessions*, not among the demands made by the King, *ταῦτα δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῶν στρατηγῶν ἐπιτελούντων, μὴ στρατεύειν Ἀθηναίους εἰς τὴν χώραν ἧς βασιλεὺς ἄρχει*. But here I am concerned with the comment:

<sup>53</sup> See above, note 38.

<sup>54</sup> Xenophon, *Hell.*, III, 4, 5.

<sup>55</sup> He goes on: "so bad are they, that the King orders Tissaphernes' execution." This is a remarkable telescoping of events: see *Hell.*, III, 4, 6-25.



"these are victor's terms," with the implication that Athens was not victorious in 449. I know that this is now commonly assumed; but there is little evidence for it. There is no doubt that, however defiant and confident Agesilaus may have been,<sup>56</sup> the position of the Greeks in Asia (of the Greek cities, that is, and of the forces defending them) was not so secure against Persia in 396 as it had been in 449. Athens had then just won a double victory as decisive tactically as the Eurymedon (this is from the sober words of Thucydides, not from the grandiloquent epigram), a victory which proved once more both her superiority at sea and the great difficulties which would confront the Persians if they attempted to recover, not the islands, but the cities of the Aegean and Hellespontine coasts. Since at the same time the disaster in Egypt had proved the costliness of any attack on the Persian land positions (and Athens had besides some anxieties in Greece), both sides were ready for peace. But this is not to deny the reality of Athens' recent victory; and if the clauses limiting the movements of the Persian army and fleet are not "victor's terms," what are? Agesilaus did not propose anything so humiliating to Persia. If Athens could secure the King's agreement that he would not move his fleet west of Phaselis nor his army beyond Sardes, she was not likely at the same time to retreat from her own position in Ionia.

Schwartz was right: "Der Vertrag mit Persien oder der sogenannte Kalliasfrieden ist kein Problem der politischen, sondern der litterarischen Geschichte."<sup>57</sup> Wade-Gery, in picking up some fragments of evidence, Isocrates, IV, 120, and his river Halys, Theopompus' denial of the treaty and his *πρὸς Δαρείον* (this fragment we might describe in the language of the epigraphists as *undique mutilum* and *difficile lectu*), and ingeniously fitting them into the great jigsaw puzzle of Greek history, has, I feel sure, mistaken the place to which they belong: which is not the political history of the fifth century, but the literary history of the fourth.

A. W. GOMME.

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

<sup>56</sup> He was after all proposing peace terms, and, had Persia been prepared to consider them seriously, they would necessarily have included a clause by which he would agree to "sail away home," or something similar, as in the proposals of the year before (*Hell.*, III, 2, 20).

<sup>57</sup> E. Schwartz, *Hermes*, XXXV (1900), p. 111, quoted by Wade-Gery.

# “EPIC, AS I HERE DEFINE IT.”

The unfortunate consequences of an editor's misguided attempt to clarify a text by deletion have seldom been more fully realized than in the case of Überweg's suggestion that ἐποποιία be dropped,<sup>1</sup> despite the entire Greek manuscript tradition, in Aristotle's definition of that previously unnamed genus of the poetic art:

ἡ δὲ ἐποποιία μόνον τοῖς λόγοις ψιλοῖς ἢ τοῖς μέτροις καὶ τούτοις εἴτε  
μυνοῦσα μετ' ἀλλήλων εἶθ' ἐνὶ τινὶ γένει χρωμένη τῶν μέτρων (ἀνώνυμος)  
τυγχάνουσα μέχρι τοῦ νῦν

(*Poetics*, I, 1447 a 28-b 9).<sup>2</sup>

For its full meaning this passage should be rendered, I believe, as follows: “‘Epic’ uses only spoken words—prose or verse without musical accompaniment, whether combining the various meters with one another or using some one kind; it happens to have been without a name until now.”<sup>3</sup> By my translation,

<sup>1</sup> For Überweg's text see his *Aristotelis Ars Poetica ad fidem potissimum codicis antiquissimi A<sup>c</sup>* [Parisinus 1741] (Berlin, 1870). J. Tkatsch, *Die arabische Übersetzung der Poetik des Aristoteles* (Vienna, 1928-32), II, p. 157a, notes that Überweg was probably influenced to strike out the word by Vahlen's analysis of the difficulties which the text affords; cf. J. Vahlen, *Beiträge zu Aristoteles Poetik*, I (Vienna, 1865), pp. 5-6. But see *infra*, note 37.

<sup>2</sup> The text follows cod. Parisinus 1741, except for the interpolation of ἀνώνυμος in 1447 b 9. This emendation, originally proposed by J. Bernays, *Über Wirkung der Tragödie* (Breslau, 1857), p. 186, and vindicated by the Arabic version of the *Poetics*, has received general acceptance; cf. Tkatsch, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 155b-6. See *infra*, note 21. I. Bywater, *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry* (Oxford, 1909), p. 105, note on 1447 a 28, argues, following Suckow, for altering τυγχάνουσα to τυγχάνει οὔσα; this is unnecessary since, by the logic of the context, χρῆται or μμεῖται is to be understood after ἡ δὲ ἐποποιία.

<sup>3</sup> Precedent for rendering τοῖς λόγοις as “words” is offered in Allan Gilbert's translation of the *Poetics*; cf. his *Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden* (New York, 1940), p. 70. Since in 1447 a 22 “speech” (λόγος) is stated to be characteristic of all the poetic arts, it is here probably accurate to define the λόγοι as “spoken.” See *infra*, pp. 347 ff. On τοῖς λόγοις ψιλοῖς ἢ τοῖς μέτροις, cf. Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. 106, note on 1447 a 29. Tkatsch, *op. cit.*, II, p. 157a, following Eucken, would translate μέχρι τοῦ νῦν as equivalent to ἐτι καὶ νῦν; the phrases are not regularly

obviously, *ἐποποιία* does not mean "epic" in the generally understood sense of the word; by the reading of those many who accept Überweg's emendation, Aristotle appears to define a genus of poetry for which he knew and could propose no name.<sup>4</sup> Great importance may not seem to attach to the question whether the newly defined genus was called "epic" or continued nameless, but, as I shall attempt to show, the deletion of *ἐποποιία* has indirectly resulted in rendering obscure the essential structure of Chapter I of the *Poetics*.

The evidence available to us suggests that *ἐποποιία* was not a common word; it is not to be found in Aristotle outside the *Poetics*, and Liddell and Scott cite only two further occurrences of it.<sup>5</sup> Related words, such as the almost equally rare *ἐποποιός*<sup>6</sup>

identical, however, and many instances may readily be found in Aristotle of the use of *μέχρι τοῦ νῦν* in the sense more natural here; cf. Bonitz, *Index*, s. v. Tkatsch himself renders the Arabic as "usque ad haec tempora"; cf. *op. cit.*, I, p. 221.

<sup>4</sup> They translate: "There is further an art which . . .," "There is another art which . . .," "But the art which . . .," etc. These are the phrases, respectively, of Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. 5; S. H. Butcher, *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art* (London, 1890), p. 5; and Gilbert, *op. cit.*, p. 70. Modern scholars, including A. Gudeman, *Aristoteles ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΙΗΤΙΚΗΣ* (Berlin, 1934), A. Rostagni, *La Poetica di Aristotele* (Turin, 1934), and I. Sykoutris, *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΟΥΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΙΗΤΙΚΗΣ* (Athens, 1937), concur in interpreting the passage in this way. Rostagni explains the presence of *ἐποποιία* in the traditional text as "una zeppa introdotta da chi non comprese il vero termine sottinteso" (*op. cit.*, p. 3).

<sup>5</sup> In the first citation (Herodotus, II, 116), *ἐποποιία* almost certainly means "epic," although, as D. S. Margoliouth points out (*The Poetics of Aristotle* [London, 1911], p. 68), "there is no reference to meter." The second citation, from *Papyri Graecae Magicae*, edited and translated by K. Preisendanz (Leipzig and Berlin, 1928-31), I, p. 328, indicates by *ἐποποιία* "divination by means of Homeric verses." Hermias Alexandrinus, *In Platonis Phaedrum*, 245 A, quoted by Vahlen, *Aristotelis de arte poetica liber* (Leipzig, 1885), p. 4, also uses the word, perhaps with the meaning attached to it by the traditional text in 1447 a 28; see *infra*, note 42.

<sup>6</sup> In Herodotus, II, 120, and Aristotle, *Poetics*, I, 1447 b 15, *ἐποποιός* means "hexameter poet"; for comment on Aristotle's use of the word, see *infra*, note 14. It is ambiguous in Neanthes (quoted in Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* [Paris, 1885], III, p. 2, from Athenaeus, VII, 296c), and probably means "verse-maker" in Lucian, *Jupiter Tragoedus*, 6.

and the very familiar ἔπη,<sup>7</sup> indicate that it probably meant narrative poetry in hexameters after the manner of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. But, if ἐποποιία was an unfamiliar word, Aristotle's extension of its meaning would not have seemed as arbitrary to a Greek as the corresponding extension of "epic" appears to us. The fact that ἔπη was sometimes used loosely affords inadequate support for the view of Margoliouth that the definition of Chapter I represents the significance of the word in popular speech.<sup>8</sup>

It is at least possible that Aristotle intended that ἐποποιία should be interpreted etymologically as "verbal composition" or "word-composing." Ἔπος has, of course, as its primary meaning "word" (Skt. *vācas*). It will be remembered that among the German authorities of the 19th century Bernays, Stahr, and Susemihl translated ἐποποιία as "Wortdichtung" in 1447 a 28.<sup>9</sup> According to Susemihl:

'Epos' heisst im Griechischen eigentlich 'Wort,' und daher kann Aristoteles diesen Namen der epischen Dichtung im weitern Sinne als der bloßen 'Wortdichtung' für alle diejenigen Felder der Poesie ausprägen, welche sich dergestalt ohne Hülfe von Gesang, Musik und Tanz mit dem bloßen Wort in gebundener oder gar ungebundener Rede begnügen.

If we were quite certain that Aristotle meant such an interpretation, we should have to attempt an equivalent translation. But, whereas "Wortdichtung" has been thought satisfactory in German, "word-poetry" would be confusing in English.<sup>10</sup> "Verbal

<sup>7</sup> In Aristotle, according to Bonitz, *Index*, s. v., ἔπη are always the hexameters of epic poetry. One may cite also: Herodotus, II, 116, 117, 118; Thucydides, I, 3; Plato, *Republic*, 396 E, etc. Phrases such as ἐπὶ ἑπῶν ποιήσει (Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, I, 43) and ἐν τε τῇ τῶν ἑπῶν ποιήσει (Plato, *Republic*, 394 C) refer to the composition of hexameters.

<sup>8</sup> Ἐπη may be verses in any meter, sometimes with musical accompaniment; Margoliouth, *op. cit.*, p. 68, cites Plato, *Protagoras*, 338 D, Photius, *Bibliotheca*, 319 a 17, and the scholia on Dionysius Thrax, in Bekker's *Anecdota*, 751. Cf., also Plato, *Republic*, 379 A and *Laws*, 810 E.

<sup>9</sup> This translation was first proposed by Bernays, *op. cit.*, p. 186; cf., also, A. Stahr, *Aristoteles Poetik übersetzt und erklärt* (Stuttgart, 1860) and F. Susemihl, *Aristoteles über die Dichtkunst* (Leipzig, 1865), p. 159.

<sup>10</sup> Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. 106, note on 1447 a 28, objected, perhaps

composition" and "word-composing" would also be ambiguous, though it might perhaps be argued that *ἐποποιία* was no less so. Margoliouth (*op. cit.*, p. 70) proposed "romance," a word much too miscellaneous in connotation. "Literature" would not do; in common understanding it includes tragedy, comedy, and the various forms of lyric, which, we shall see, the new genus excludes as they were known in Greece.<sup>11</sup> Against the makeshift of transliteration there is the fact that our dictionaries define "epopoeia" as "epic poetry; also an epic poem." Such considerations may fairly be dismissed, however, in the realization that if Aristotle had wished to stress the etymological relationship between *ἐποποιία* and *ἔπος*, he would almost necessarily have defined it as using not *λόγοι* but *ἔπη*. It obviates many difficulties to translate "epic" in 1447 a 28, with quotation marks to prevent misunderstanding.<sup>12</sup>

We must, however, consider the case for deletion. It is, of course, indisputable that in the later chapters of the *Poetics* Aristotle uses *ἐποποιία* to signify "epic" in the familiar sense of the word,<sup>13</sup> but, on the evidence of his usage of several important words now in a narrow and now in an extended sense, consistency is not characteristic of his critical terminology.<sup>14</sup> That he chose *ἐποποιία* as a generic term for forms of poetic art which resemble

rightly, that "word-poetry" was "against the analogy of all similar compounds . . . , in which the *-ποιία* means simply the making of something." The objection would not seem to apply to "verbal composition" or "word-composing."

<sup>11</sup> W. H. Fyfe, *Aristotle's Art of Poetry* (Oxford, 1940), p. 2, claims for Aristotle the view that "Literature is the art which 'imitates' life in words. Those who do this are 'poets' whether they write in prose or in one or many kinds of meter." But A. S. Owen, *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry* (Oxford, 1931), p. 55, rightly points out that, "The French 'belles-lettres' is too limited, the English 'literature' too vague."

<sup>12</sup> In the Greek, the definite article before *ἐποποιία* perhaps reminds the reader of the special interpretation promised for the word in 1447 a 13; see *infra*, p. 345.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. 1449 b 9, 14; 1455 b 16; 1459 b 8, 18; 1460 a 13, 1462 a 2, 12, 14, b 15, 16.

<sup>14</sup> In the present context, for example, *ἐποποιοί* (1447 b 14) means "hexameter poets," despite the broader meaning given *ἐποποιία*. In 1447 b 13-20 and 1451 b 27-30, the poet (*ποιητής*) is an imitator, not a versifier; on the other hand, in *Rhetoric*, III, 1408 b 31-32, distinction is drawn between poem (*ποίημα*) and prose (*λόγος*) that the one is metrical, the other not. In 1447 a 28 *πᾶσις* is distinguished from *πάθος*,



epic in the important respect that they use "words only" (i. e., they make no use of musical accompaniment)<sup>15</sup> is not at all surprising, if we consider the relevance of his remarks in the *Rhetoric* on naming the nameless:

\*Ἐτι δὲ οὐ πρόρωθεν δεῖ, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν συγγενῶν καὶ τῶν ὁμοειδῶν μεταφέρειν τὰ ἀνώνυμα ὀνομασμένως ὃ λεχθέν δῆλόν ἐστιν ὅτι συγγενές . . .

(*Rhetoric*, III, 1405 a 34-37).

"When we name nameless things we should take the names not from afar, but, metaphorically, from things closely related and of the same kind, so that when a thing is mentioned it is clear that it is related."

Thus, by metaphor, the name of a species may be given to a genus.<sup>16</sup> If *ἐποποιία* underwent a change in etymological interpretation in the extension of its meaning, the process was not, to be sure, metaphorical, but, in any event, it clearly illustrates the transference of the name of a species to a genus when the genus has hitherto been nameless. Aristotle, indeed, often comments on the lack of generic terms in everyday language, sometimes noting similar instances of the creation of generic from specific terms.<sup>17</sup> It may be pointed out, further, that in the present context Aristotle's extension of the meaning of *ποιητής* (1447 b 19) parallels his treatment of *ἐποποιία*.

A second argument asserted for deletion is the fact, frequently noted, that the Arabic version shows no evidence of *ἐποποιία* in this passage. I find myself in agreement with those students of

but in 1452 b 12 *πάθος* is defined as *πρᾶξις φθαρτικὴ ἢ ὀδυνηρά*. The generic definition of *τραγωδία* is given in 1449 b 24 f.; elsewhere, satyr-plays are not distinguished from tragedies (cf. Gudeman, *op. cit.*, p. 318, s. v. "*Φορκίδες*"), and in 1450 a 25 it is acknowledged that most of the tragedies of Aristotle's own day are *ἀήθεις*. Thus, too, *λόγος* is used in a variety of senses: as "speech" (1447 a 22), as "dialogue" (1449 a 17), as "plot" (1455 b 17), etc.

<sup>15</sup> In Aristotle's time the rhapsodists did not use the lyre as an accompaniment in their recitation of the epic poets; cf. D. B. Munro, *Homer's Odyssey* [Books XIII-XXIV] (Oxford, 1901), pp. 394 ff.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *Poetics*, XXI, 1457 b 6-8: *μεταφορά δὲ ἐστὶν ὀνόματος ἀλλοτρίου ἐπιφορά ἢ ἀπὸ γένους ἐπὶ εἶδος ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ εἶδους ἐπὶ τὸ γένος, κτλ.* Examples of transference from species to genus are given in 1457 b 11-13 and in 1461 a 16-21, 30-31.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *Meteorology*, I, 341 b 15, 387 b 2; *Physics*, V, 226 a 26; *Politics*, III, 1275 a 26; *De Partibus Animalium*, III, 669 b 9.

the *Poetics* who believe that to give preference to the Arabic translation of a Syriac translation of the Greek is inadvisable except when the Greek is defective and emendation is warranted by its success in illuminating a passage otherwise inscrutable.<sup>18</sup> In this instance the Greek is indisputable and the emendation of no real assistance to us.

As a matter of fact, no one has proposed that *ἐποποιία* be dropped in the first instance of its usage in the *Poetics* a few lines previously (1447 a 13) although the Arabic does not at that point render the word as "epic," if it preserves it in any sense.<sup>19</sup> All modern translators of the Greek, with the exception of Margoliouth, there give "epic," later rejecting 1447 a 28-b 9 as its definition. Margoliouth alone reconciles the two passages on the basis of the traditional text, construing *ἐποποιία* in both instances as a generic term for "compositions in any meter and even in prose" (*op. cit.*, pp. 66-71).<sup>20</sup> He does not, however, acknowledge that Aristotle intended to designate by the word a previously unnamed group of the poetic arts.<sup>21</sup> It has not been pointed out, I think, that the particle *δή* following *ἐποποιία* in 1447 a 13 may very well have served to indicate an unfamiliar, technical, or even ironical usage of the word.<sup>22</sup> I should, accordingly, there translate: "Epic, as I here define it."

<sup>18</sup> The interpolation of *ἀνώνυμος* in 1447 b 9 (see *supra*, note 2) appears to be justified on these grounds.

<sup>19</sup> Tkatsch, who elsewhere renders the Arabic equivalent of *ἐποποιία* as "perfectio epeon" (1449 b 14, 20) or "ars epeon" (1462 a 2, 14, etc.), here gives "omnis poesis atque omnis recitatio poetica." Did the Arabic thus preserve the idea that in this instance *ἐποποιία* includes all the kinds of poetry recited by the rhapsodists? See *infra*, p. 348.

<sup>20</sup> F. Albergiani, *Aristotele, La Poetica* (Florence, 1934), p. 73, resorts to the expedient of amplifying 1447 a 28 as follows: *ἡ δὲ ἐποποιία <καὶ ἡ δὲ τέχνη> μόνον*. There is no warrant for this alteration in any MS, and Albergiani's translation of the proposed reading is puzzling: "l'epopea e le arti (*sic*) che si servono della nuda parola. . ."

<sup>21</sup> Margoliouth's translation of the Arabic confirms Bernays' interpolation of *ἀνώνυμος* in 1447 b 9, which, he further asserts, "no one versed in Aristotle would hesitate to accept" (*op. cit.*, p. 67). On the other hand, he later declares (*ibid.*, p. 117) that "in the case of Bernays's supplement the 'confirmation' of the Arabic does not help it, but merely shows that an infelicitous suggestion of the nineteenth century had been anticipated before the tenth." He does not admit *ἀνώνυμος* to his Greek text, and his English rendering is unintelligible.

<sup>22</sup> J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1934), p. 234, re-

It is only, however, when we examine the problem in the light of the structure and meaning of Chapter I as a whole that the case for the retention of *ἐποποιία* in 1447 a 28 becomes indisputable. First of all, we may amplify Aristotle's definition of the word by considering his discussion of the nature of poetic art (*ἡ ποιητική*). For him, as for Plato, it is essentially an "imitative" activity.<sup>23</sup> Rejecting the ordinary conception of the *ποιητής* as a versifier (1447 b 15-20), he inferentially defines as *ποίησις* all imitative literature in prose and verse—with and without musical accompaniment.<sup>24</sup> Its meaning thus corresponds approximately with that of "music" (*ἡ μουσική*) in Plato.<sup>25</sup> The poetic arts are also characterized in 1447 a 21-22 by their use, one and all, of three media: rhythm (*ῥυθμός*), speech (*λόγος*), and tone (*ἁρμονία*).<sup>26</sup> Rhythm ranks first in importance, for, in a broad sense, it is equivalent to the formal ordering which characterizes the beautiful object.<sup>27</sup> It is, too, the struc-

marks that "*δή*, without a verb of saying, thinking, etc., often denotes that words are not to be taken at their face value, objectively, but express something merely believed, or ironically supposed, to be true. Hence *δή* often gives the effect of inverted commas." Aristotle frequently employs *δή* in definitions, thus calling attention to the somewhat arbitrary usages characteristic of his terminology: cf. *Rhetoric*, II, 1378 a 33, 1382 b 29, 1383 b 13; *Nicomachean Ethics*, VI, 1162 b 25; *Politics*, III, 1275 a 32-33.

<sup>23</sup> *Poetics*, IV, 1447 a 16. For Plato, cf. *Symposium* 205 C, *Republic* 604 C, etc.

<sup>24</sup> In *Metaphysics*, VII, 1032 a 27, *ποίησις* is extended to creative activity in general. Cf. also, *On the Soul*, III, 426 a 9; *Physics*, III, 202 a 23. Diotima of Mantinea, speaking for Plato (*Symposium* 205 C), criticizes the conventional limitation of *ποίησις* to music and verse; she would extend the term to all the arts and crafts.

<sup>25</sup> See *infra*, p. 351.

<sup>26</sup> In *Republic* 398 D, Plato indicates these three media as characteristic of song: *τὸ μέλος ἐκ τριῶν ἐστὶ συγκείμενον, λόγου τε καὶ ἁρμονίας καὶ ῥυθμοῦ*. In making them the criteria of the poetic arts generally, Aristotle rearranges the list, giving prominence to rhythm. The arts mentioned in 1447 a 13-16 one and all (*ἅπασαι*) make constant use of these media, but they may be used separately or in combinations in the arts of the flute and lyre and in dancing; see *infra*, note 31. In 1447 b 24-28, Aristotle restates the media as rhythm, song (*μέλος*), and meter (*μέτρον*); he thus is enabled to remark that the dithyramb and the nomen use these three throughout, tragedy and comedy "according to the part" (*κατὰ μέρος*).

<sup>27</sup> In *Metaphysics*, I, 985 b 16 and VII, 1042 b 14, rhythm is defined

tural principle of language (λέξις), whether prose or verse—the various meters being defined as subdivisions of the rhythms.<sup>28</sup> Aristotle indicates a specific form of language—speech—as essential to the poetic arts since he thinks of them, apparently, as requiring vocal recitation.<sup>29</sup> Whether or not these arts use musical accompaniment, vocal tone is thus a fundamental aspect of the delivery.<sup>30</sup>

In certain arts, the three media are sometimes used separately or in combination. For example, the arts of the flute and the lyre may divest themselves of speech and use only musical tones in rhythmical patterns, and some dancers imitate merely "through rhythms in gestures."<sup>31</sup> Aristotle would not classify these arts as poetic.

as form (σχῆμα). Later, in XIII, 1078 a 37, beauty is thus described: τοῦ δὲ καλοῦ μέγιστα εἶδη τάξις καὶ συμμετρία καὶ τὸ ὀρισμένον. Many instances of the extended meaning of ῥυθμός as "proportion or symmetry of parts" are cited from general usage, *sub verbo*, in Liddell and Scott. The word is sometimes equivalent to logical structure; cf. Callimachus, *Epigrammata*, 44, 5: οὐκ ἀπὸ ῥυθμοῦ εἰκάσω. In *Politics*, VIII, 1340 a 18 f., Aristotle asserts rhythms to be representations (ὁμοιώματα) of various moral qualities.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. *Rhetoric*, III, 1408 b 28-29: περαίνεται δὲ ἀριθμῷ πάντα· ὁ δὲ τοῦ σχήματος τῆς λέξεως ἀριθμὸς ῥυθμός ἐστιν, οὗ καὶ τὰ μέτρα τμήματα (accepting Bywater's emendation of τμήματα for τμητά of the MSS), and *Poetics*, IV, 1448 b 21-22: τὰ γὰρ μέτρα ὅτι μόρια τῶν ῥυθμῶν ἐστὶ φανερόν. By the argument of the *Rhetoric* (*loc. cit.*), metrical speech fails to persuade because of its artificiality (πεπλάσθαι γὰρ δοκεῖ); prose speech must, however, be rhythmical—it will otherwise be incomprehensible (ἄγνωστον) and displeasing (ἀηδές).

<sup>29</sup> It is true, Aristotle remarks in *Poetics*, XXVI, 1462 a 12 that tragedy is effective in reading (διὰ τοῦ ἀναγιγνώσκειν); but the phrase perhaps implies reading aloud, without dramatic gesture or musical accompaniment. Elsewhere, and particularly in Chapter I, he has in mind the dramatic performance of tragedy. Comedy, the mimes, and probably the Socratic dialogues he thought of as intended for spoken delivery; the other forms of non-dramatic "poetry," for rhapsodic recitation. See *infra*, p. 348. Cf. the definition of λόγος in *Poetics*, XX, 1457 a 23-24: λόγος δὲ φωνῇ συνθετὴ σημαντικὴ.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. *Rhetoric*, III, 1403 b 31. Plato (*Laus* 665 A) defines vocal tone: τῇ [τάξει] δ' αὖ τῆς φωνῆς, τοῦ τε ὀξέος ἅμα καὶ βαρέος συγκεραννύμενων, ἀρμονία ὄνομα προσαγορεύοιτο. Like rhythm, it is representative of character; cf. *Republic* 399 A-C.

<sup>31</sup> Thus Aristotle notes that tone and rhythm are sometimes "used alone by the arts of the flute and the lyre" (1447 a 23-26); that this

The statement that the hitherto nameless genus of the poetic art "uses only spoken words—prose or verse without musical accompaniment" does not, then, indicate that it employs but one of the three media.<sup>32</sup> Aristotle wished to emphasize the fact that it made no use, rather, of musical accompaniment. The phrase adopted (*μόνον τοῖς λόγοις*) perfectly suits his purpose, since it rules out such accompaniment and easily subsumes the three media, recalling one of them specifically. By the logic of the general argument, "epic," as defined in Chapter I, must be understood, in all its forms, to give intonation and rhythmical form to speech. As examples in prose, Aristotle cites the mimes of Sophron and Xenarchus, and the Socratic dialogues.<sup>33</sup> He turns for examples in verse to the forms which were recited, without musical accompaniment, by the rhapsodists.<sup>34</sup> So it is

is a deviation from the regular practice is suggested by the circumstantial participle *χρώμεναι*. He also remarks that "some dancers imitate by rhythm itself, without tone" (1447 a 26-27); this would seem to be the plain sense of *μιμῶνται . . . οἱ τῶν ὀρχηστῶν*, the reading of all the texts except Parisinus 2038 and the Arabic version. It is worth noting that Plato had inveighed against such violations of propriety as *μέλος καὶ ῥυθμὸν ἀνευ ῥημάτων* and *ῥυθμὸν καὶ σχήματα μέλους χωρὶς* (*Lais* 669 D-670). He had further declared that without the words of song the music of the flute and the lyre is hard to understand, as to the meaning intended, the objects represented, and their significance. Music should always be subordinate to dance and song (*ὑπὸ ὀρχησίν τε καὶ ᾠδῇν*). To use the flute and the lyre separately shows complete lack of taste (*πᾶσά τις ἀμουσία*) and constitutes merest sensationalism (*θαυματοουργία*). In a later passage (672 E) Plato stated that half of the art of the dance depends upon the rhythms and tones of the voice.

<sup>32</sup> Aristotle does not describe the new genus as using *speech* only, but *words* only (*μόνον τοῖς λόγοις*). See *supra*, note 3.

<sup>33</sup> For a summary description of the mimes of Sophron, cf. Sykoutris, *op. cit.*, p. 9, n. 8; on Xenarchus, cf. *ibid.*, p. 10, n. 1. According to Bywater's translation of 1447 b 9-13 (*op. cit.*, p. 5), Aristotle remarks the lack of a generic term for the mimes and the dialogues alone. Bywater consequently regards 1447 b 13-23 as a digression from the discussion of the hitherto nameless genus (*op. cit.*, p. 108, note on 1447 b 11). But it is difficult to imagine Socratic dialogues "in trimeters or elegiacs or some other kind of verse" (Bywater's translation). And if one retains *ἐποποιία* in 1447 a 28, there is no possibility of accepting Bywater's view, for the new genus would then exclude the species from which its name derives.

<sup>34</sup> For such verse Aristotle later uses the term *ψιλομετρία* (1448 a 11).



that, whereas imitation, not meter, is stated to be the essential criterion of poetic art, in the new genus the poet might imitate "in iambic trimeters or elegiacs or any other meters of the kind";<sup>35</sup> Homer's epics constitute its most important species. Chaeremon's rhapsody, the *Centaur*, combining all the meters, belongs in the category.<sup>36</sup>

One might, to be sure, grant these facts as to the character and scope of the new genus without consenting to retain *ἐποποιία* as Aristotle's designation for it. What makes such a decision inevitable is a fact which Vahlen alone seems to have recognized hitherto: namely, that in 1447 a 13-16 Aristotle has indicated the pattern of the argument of Chapter I, listing, beginning with "epic," the forms of the poetic art which he later describes:

ἐποποιία δὴ καὶ ἡ τῆς τραγωδίας ποίησις, ἔτι δὲ κωμωδία καὶ ἡ διθυραμβοποιητικὴ καὶ τῆς ἀνθητικῆς ἢ πλείστη καὶ κιθαριστικῆς πᾶσαι τυγχάνουσιν οὔσαι μιμήσεις τὸ σύνολον

(*Poetics*, I, 1447 a 13-16).<sup>37</sup>

This passage I should translate: "Epic, as I here define it, and the composing of tragedy—also, then, comedy—and the art of composing dithyrambs, and, indeed, for the most part, the arts of

A discussion of the art of the rhapsodists (*ῥαψωδία*) will be found in A. and M. Croiset, *An Abridged History of Greek Literature* (New York, 1904), pp. 52-3, 89.

<sup>35</sup> *Poetics*, I, 1447 b 11-12. There is probably no allusion to the iambic trimeters of dramatic dialogue in this passage. The phrase τῶν ἄλλων τινῶν τῶν τοιούτων Gudeman, *op. cit.*, p. 90, cites as "eine Bequemlichkeitsfloskel"; more likely, it comprehends all other forms of poetry suited to rhapsodic recitation.

<sup>36</sup> Chaeremon's lost *Centaur* was, according to Athenaeus (608 e), a *δρᾶμα πολύμετρον*. It was probably intended for rhapsodic recitation and for reading aloud; cf. *Rhetoric*, III, 1413 b 12-13, where Aristotle speaks of Chaeremon as a *λογογράφος* (a writer in "words only"?) and as being among the *ἀναγνωστικοί*. He seems, on the whole, to have disapproved of Chaeremon's innovations; cf. *Poetics*, XXIV, 1460 a 2.

<sup>37</sup> In his *Aristotelis de Arte Poetica Liber* (Leipzig, 1885), p. 90, Vahlen argues that the question as to whether *ἐποποιία* should be retained in 1447 a 28 cannot be settled without consideration of the significance of the word in 1447 a 13: "quia *ἐποποιία* nomen initio enuntiati (1447 a 28) abesse voluerunt, illud non satis videntur reputasse, quae 1447 a 13 proposita sint genera deinceps omnia recenseri."

the flute and the lyre all are found to be kinds of imitation in their entirety."

Now it is customary to render ἐποποιία in this passage as "epic" without the qualification provided by the particle δῆ.<sup>38</sup> And τῆς αὐλητικῆς ἢ πλείστη καὶ κιθαριστικῆς has regularly been understood as "most music on the flute and the lyre."<sup>39</sup> The sentence, as a whole, has thus been taken to present a miscellaneous list of imitative arts, headed, at random, by epic, and including forms of instrumental music. Considering, however, the emphasis which the sentence gives to specifically poetic composition (ἐποποιία, ἢ τῆς τραγωδίας ποίησις, ἢ διθυραμβοποιητική), there is reason to question the likelihood of any reference to instrumental music as such.<sup>40</sup> Since the arts of the flute and the lyre regularly subordinated music to poetry, Aristotle might, indeed, quite naturally have seen fit to classify most forms of both among the poetic arts. And tragedy, comedy, and dithyrambic poetry are as clearly associated with the arts of the flute and the lyre. I propose, accordingly, to regard the expression καὶ τῆς αὐλητικῆς ἢ πλείστη καὶ κιθαριστικῆς as, in part, exegetical. Thus, the three forms mentioned and the other poetic arts which use musical accompaniment are set in contrast with those making up the new genus, which use "words only." All the poetic arts, unlike instrumental music (see *supra*, note 40), are "kinds of imitation in their entirety."<sup>41</sup>

<sup>38</sup> It is neglected by all the English translators except Margoliouth who gives "then" (*op. cit.*, p. 125).

<sup>39</sup> This is the translation of Gilbert, *op. cit.*, p. 69. Butcher, *op. cit.*, p. 7, renders: "the music of the flute and the lyre in most of their forms." Bywater, *op. cit.*, p. 3, has "most flute-playing and lyre-playing." Margoliouth, with characteristic independence, gives "and (with few exceptions) Instrumental Music, wind or stringed" (*op. cit.*, p. 125). Menardos' translation, available in Sykoutris' edition, reads: καὶ κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον μέρος ἡ αὐλητικὴ καὶ ἡ κιθαριστικὴ (*op. cit.*, p. 4).

<sup>40</sup> Plato, it has been pointed out above (note 31), objected to such music, noting (*Laws* 669 E) that it is impossible to tell what, among things worth imitating, it represents (ὅτῳ ἔοικε τῶν ἀξιολόγων μιμημάτων); that is, if it is imitative, it is not clearly so. Aristotle probably agreed with Plato in condemning such music; cf. *Politics*, VIII, 1341 a 11, and particularly *ibid.*, 25.

<sup>41</sup> According to Margoliouth, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-4, the poetic arts, in contradistinction to the representational arts (painting, sculpture, etc.),

By this crucial sentence, then, poetic art is divided into two categories: 1) *ἐποποιία*, which later is defined as using "words only," and 2) those forms of the art which use musical accompaniment. After this brief statement, Aristotle proceeds to remarks concerning: 1) the three differentia of the poetic arts (1447 a 16-18), 2) media of various representational arts (1447 a 18-20), 3) the three media characteristic of the poetic arts (1447 a 21-22), and 4) the use of these media in instrumental music and dancing (1447 a 22-28). These observations completed, he follows the outline given in 1447 a 13-16, discussing: 1) *ἐποποιία*, the forms of poetic composition devoid of musical accompaniment (1447 a 28-b 24), and 2) the forms of poetic composition associated with the arts of the flute and the lyre (1447 b 24-29). It should now be clear that the usual translation of 1447 a 13-16 obscures the fact that the sentence establishes in advance the central argument of Chapter I. That is to say, unless *ἐποποιία* be understood in 1447 a 13 to have the sense given it by the traditional texts in 1447 a 28-b 9, neither 1447 a 14-16 nor the argument of Chapter I attains its full significance.

In conclusion, it is worthwhile to consider Plato's treatment of the same problem. In the *Phaedrus* (278 C) his objections to poetry apply both to that with musical accompaniment (*ποίησις ἐν ᾧδῃ*) and to that without (*ποίησις ψυλή*).<sup>42</sup> In the *Republic* (398 B-C), he divides *ἡ μουσική* into two categories: 1) *λόγοι* and *μῦθοι*, 2) *ᾠδαί* and *μέλη*. Instrumental music accompanies the second of these. It is not entirely clear whether prose narratives are included under the first, but, in a neighboring passage (392 B), *λογοποιοί* are prose-writers, in contrast to *ποιηταί*, versifiers. Again in the *Republic* (601 B), he raises specifically aesthetic objections to poetry without music, declaring that poetic compositions stripped of the "colors" (*χρώματα*)

are imitative in both form and matter. But "in their entirety" (*τὸ σύνολον*) may well refer to the media, subjects, and style of imitation; i. e., the differentia specified in 1447 a 16-18.

<sup>42</sup> Cf., also, *Phaedrus* 245 A, for Plato's distinction *κατά τε ᾠδὰς καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἄλλην ποίησιν*. Of this passage Hermias Alexandrinus (see *supra*, note 5) declares: *ᾠδὰς δὲ λέγει τὰ τῶν λυρικῶν συγγράμματα, τὴν δὲ ἄλλην ποίησιν ἐποποιῶν καὶ ἱαμβοποιῶν καὶ τᾶλλα εἶδη τῆς ποιήσεως ἧ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῷ περὶ ποιητικῆς*. I take the phrase *καὶ ἱαμβοποιῶν* . . . *ποιήσεως* to be exegetical after *ἐποποιῶν*.

of music are "like the faces of those who are in the prime of life, but not beautiful, as they come to be seen when the bloom of youth deserts them" (οὐκοῦν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἔοικε τοῖς τῶν ὡραίων προσώποις, καλῶν δὲ μή, οἷα γίγνεται ἰδεῖν, ὅταν αὐτὰ τὸ ἄνθος προλίπη;). In the *Laws*, the whole matter is discussed in ethical terms. It is the moral ambiguity of poetry without musical accompaniment that distresses Plato in his quest for proper materials for the education of the young:

πρὸς δὲ δὴ μαθήματα ἄλυσρα ποιητῶν κείμενα ἐν γράμμασι, τοῖς μὲν μετὰ μέτρων, τοῖς δ' ἄνευ ῥυθμῶν τμημάτων, ἃ δὴ συγγράμματα κατὰ λόγον εἰρημένα μόνον, τητῶμενα ῥυθμοῦ τε καὶ ἁρμονίας, σφαιερὰ γράμμαθ' ἡμῖν ἐστὶν παρά τινων τῶν πολλῶν τοιούτων ἀνθρώπων καταλελειμένα

(*Laws*, 810 B).

I translate this as follows: "As for what I should call lessons without the lyre, set down in the writings of the poets—some of them are in verse, some not, and they are, as one might put it, compositions delivered in speech alone, lacking music—deceptive are the writings left to us from the many men who use such a style."

If this rendition is correct,<sup>43</sup> Plato is defining a group of poetic compositions, in prose or in poetry, without musical accompaniment. For his μαθήματα ἄλυσρα and συγγράμματα κατὰ λόγον μόνον Aristotle proposed ἐποποιία as a generic term. The definition of 1447 a 28-b 9 is, then, almost wholly derivative from Plato; Aristotle adds only the metrical medley.

Aristotle's indebtedness to Plato is also apparent in a near-by passage in the *Laws* (811 C-E), in which the Athenian Stranger

<sup>43</sup> The significance of the particle δὴ has not been emphasized in previous translations. Aristotle's similar use of δὴ with ἐποποιία in 1447 a 13 is something more than coincidence; see *supra*, p. 345. I differ also from other translators in simplifying τητῶμενα ῥυθμοῦ τε καὶ ἁρμονίας to "lacking music." Warrant for this is provided by *Laws* 655 A: ἐν γὰρ μουσικῇ καὶ σχήματα μὲν καὶ μέλη ἔνεστιν, περὶ ῥυθμὸν καὶ ἁρμονίαν οὐσης τῆς μουσικῆς; cf., *ibid.*, 669 E. Such an interpretation obviates the difficulty occasioned by Plato's statement that while some of the non-lyric compositions are metrical, all of them are without "rhythm and harmony." It is to be noted also that the phrase ῥυθμῶν τμημάτων ("partitions of rhythms") is synonymous with μέτρα; see *supra*, note 28.

claims the philosophical dialogue to be very like a poem (παντά-  
πασι ποιήσει τινὲ προσομοίως). Such writings are particularly  
suited for educational purposes, he declares, and "if, in going  
through the poems of the poets, a man should happen upon any  
akin to these dialogues, whether written in speech alone or,  
without having been written, spoken thus without musical  
accompaniment, he should not dismiss them by any means, but  
have them written" (. . . ἂν ἄρα που περιτνυχάνῃ ποιητῶν τε  
ποιήματα διεξιὼν καὶ γεγραμμένα καταλογάδην ἢ καὶ ψιλῶς οὕτως ἄνευ  
τοῦ γεγράφθαι λεγόμενα, ἀδελφά που τούτων τῶν λόγων, μὴ μεθίεναι  
τρόπῳ μηδενί, γράφεσθαι δέ).<sup>44</sup> It may well have been this passage  
which influenced Aristotle to consider the Socratic dialogues as  
poetic compositions in prose, and to include them under the new  
generic heading.<sup>45</sup>

We see, then, that the background for Aristotle's treatment of  
the problem is to be found in Plato. The conclusion seems  
finally inevitable that Aristotle drew a distinction between the  
two kinds of poetic composition, with and without musical  
accompaniment, associating the former with the arts of the  
flute and the lyre, and using ἐποποιία as the generic term for the  
latter. We may deplore the inconsistency of his usage of ἐποποιία,  
doubt the importance of the new classification, but only if we  
recognize his intention does the meaning of Chapter I become  
fully comprehensible.

SEYMOUR M. PITCHER.

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA, IOWA CITY.

<sup>44</sup> The expression καταλογάδην seems equivalent to ψιλῶς οὕτως of this  
passage and to κατὰ λόγον εἰρημένα μόνον of 810 B.

<sup>45</sup> Shorey remarks, in a review of Gomperz' *Greek Thinkers*, IV  
(Berry's transl.), *Nation*, XCVI (1913), p. 79: "Aristotle is certainly  
not the originator of the obvious generalization that assimilates artistic  
or imaginative prose to poetry. It is implied by Isocrates, and still  
more clearly in Plato's ironical application of the name poet to Lysias  
as author of the erotic discourse in the *Phaedrus*."



## THE NAME OF THE HOLY GRAIL.

Whereas Nitze, *Mod. Phil.*, XIII, p. 184 proposed anew, for the OF word *graäl*, Diez' etymon *crater* (> *Gr. κρατήρ*) "mixing vessel, cup," the *R. E. W.* adheres to Vising, *Nord. tidsskrift for filologi*, V, p. 71; VII, p. 19, and posits (no. 3830a) a "*gradalis* (8. Jh.) 'Schüssel, in die Stück für Stück stufenweise die Speisen hineingestellt werden'."

The latter etymon is evidently only a re-edition of the medieval etymon as it was proposed by the thirteenth century monk Helinandus who, in his story of the vision of a Breton hermit of the eighth century (dated exactly 718), mentions the word *gradalis* (this must have prompted the error of Meyer-Lübke, who attributed *gradalis* to the eighth century, whereas it is clearly a thirteenth-century word coined by Helinandus who died about 1229). The oft-quoted text (cf. its revised edition by Blöte, *Z. R. Ph.*, XLVIII, p. 680) speaks of the narration of this vision as a "*historia quae dicitur de gradali*": "*Gradalis* autem sive '*gradale*' gallice dicitur scutella lata et aliquantulum profunda in qua preciosae dapes cum suo jure divitibus solent apponi *gradatim* unus morsellus post alium in diversis ordinibus. Dicitur et vulgari nomine *graalz*, quia *grata* et acceptabilis est in ea comedenti, tum propter continens, quia forte argentea est, vel de alia pretiosa materia; tum propter contentum, i. e. ordinem multiplicem pretiosarum dapum." He ends by saying that he has not found the original Latin text, but will provide the French one, and translate the "*verisimiliora et utiliora*" of it into Latin.

It seems evident to me that Helinandus, who knows only of a French Grail version, offers two etymologies of the *Old French* word-form *graäl* (which he Latinizes into *gradalis-e*), two etymologies of the kind that were in use in the Middle Ages, i. e. etymologies based on a vague similitude of sounds and meaning. There is no attempt on the part of the medieval philologist to state the real, the *historical* etymon of a word, only a relationship between the sound and the meaning of an existing word (*any* relationship is acceptable whether historically true or not). Suffice it that *gra(d)al* reflects medieval "*gradualism*" or

ordinate hierarchy applied to dishes served at a table and that *graäl* is something which is "pleasant" (which is *gratum*, which *agréé*, an explanation already offered by Robert de Boron<sup>1</sup>)! The connection of OF *graäl* with a Latin prototype, with the *Ursprung*, is unknown to medieval lore, which had not yet imbibed the knowledge of the Romantic organicist and Romance philologist Diez. The fact that there can be in this system of thinking more than one etymology for one and the same word is quite in harmony with what we know of medieval etymology (there are often, in Isidore, multiple etymologies of one word: cf. the different etymologies offered in the Middle Ages for Eng. *dismal*, *M. L. N.*, LVII, p. 602) and of the medieval natural science as displayed in bestiaries and lapidaries: with the latter the favorite procedure was to look for several relationships among an animal, a stone, and the transcendent truth; similarly, to the medieval etymologists, a word form could have several connections with its inner meaning. The theocratic approach to life provided for multiple meanings of the outward appearance of things in this world, for multiple aspects of the great Etymon-God.

Thus it is surely hazardous to take the *gradalis* etymology any more seriously than that of *gratus*: to both of them alike could be applied the words which Foerster (in his *Kristian von Troyes*, *Wörterbuch*, p. 174) used of the second: "wertlose Volksetymologie"—valueless indeed for the historical etymology, if not for the analysis of the medieval mind. *Gradalis* is nothing but a construction on the part of Helinandus destined to "give

<sup>1</sup> "Par droit Graal l'apelera; / Car nuls le Graal ne verra, / Ce croi je, qu'il ne li agréé: / A touz ceuz pleist de lor contrée, / A touz agréé et abelist." Here we have evidence of the insistence on the *agréé-graäl* etymology, and on the "rightness" (*par droit*) of this etymon: it is presented as the *real* "etymon," in which sound and meaning are in agreement, or, more simply as *the έρμην*, the "true meaning." The same insistence on *par droit* is to be found in the *Rom. du S. Graal*, in a passage quoted by Gay, *Dict. arch.*, s.v. *graal*: "Et queu sera la renommée / Do vessel qui tant vous agréé? / Dites nous comment l'apele on / Quant on le numme par son non? / Petrus respont: Nun quier celer, / Qui a droit le vourra nummer, / Par droit Graal l'apelera." The traditional etymology appears again in the *Queste*, p. 270, where the grail is explained as "ce est l'escuele qui a servi a gré toz çax que j'ai trovez en mon servise."

an etymology" to the OF form *graäl*—the transformation of *graal* into *gradalis-e* (Helinandus tells us expressly that this is a French word: "gallice dicitur") was made necessary by his desire to find an etymological connection: he was bound to Latinize (therefore he added also the Latin endings *-is*, *-e*) in the case of *graäl*, which offered no other relationship with any French word existing at the time with the exception of *gré*, *agrée*, *agraer*: it was for this reason that he left *graalz* in its French form when he offered his second etymology *gratus*.<sup>2</sup> Helinandus' description of the Grail echoes only what we already know by the previous French romances ("pretiosa materia," "divitibus solent apponi," etc.); his etymological lore is negligible.<sup>3</sup>

Now the objection which Foerster offered against Diez' etymology: *κρατήρ* > \**crat-alis* is obviously no longer tenable: "das

<sup>2</sup> He evidently knew of the phonological correspondence *-t* > 0 in *gratus* > *gré*, \**adgratare* > *agrée*.

<sup>3</sup> We may watch how Helinandus seeks to harmonize his twofold etymology of *graäl*: in explaining why *graäl* is *grata et acceptabilis*, he makes the subdivision: (a) *grata* because of the *continens*, the receptacle; (b) . . . because of the content; and in this (b) part of his statement, he re-introduces the idea of *cum suo jure . . . gradatim . . . unus morsellus post alium in diversis ordinibus* under the form *ordinem multiplicem pretiosarum dapum*. All this is, evidently, of greater interest for the working of the medieval mind than for the factual information it may give about the *graäl*. If Helinandus had wished to present a "real" etymology, and not merely a Latinization of French *graäl*, he would have referred to *gradualis*, the derivative from Lat. *gradus-ūs* which has been more widely used in the Middle Ages (*gradalis pugna*, it is true, is in Diomedes) and has gone over to Old French (*grael*, *greäl* "service-book"): the latter is found in a passage of Robert de Boron, in a para-etymological pun with our *graal* (cf. Nitze). From Old French the word *grael* > *graduale* has passed over to Old Norse (*braull* in the Sagas = "grail" + "textus," cf. Hilka in the edition of the *Perceval*, ad vv. 3220 ff.).

It is to be noted that *gradus* "step," while preserved in some OF charts (Godefroy, s. vv. *gré*, *gras* "du reste rare," say Bloch-von Wartburg, s. v. *degré*), has been generally replaced in French by *degré* and dialectal *égré*, whose secondary character has been established by Jaberg, *Rev. d. lingu. rom.*, VI, pp. 717-18 (Fr. *gré* was ambiguous, and thus had to be replaced by formations with *de-*, *ex-*). This fact explains why Robert de Boron in his French text could think of explaining *graäl* only by *gré*, *agrée* < *gratus*, and not by *gré* < *gradus*.

provençalische *grazal* lehnt es sofort ab." We know today of many Provençal words with Latin *-t-* showing *-z-*, cf. *spatha* > *espaza*, *potestate* > *pozestat* (compare the polemics between Brüch, *Z. R. Ph.*, L, p. 732 and Rohlfs, *ibid.*, LI, p. 299, which reestablished beyond doubt the factual existence of the Provençal development). What seems to me really unfavorable to the *κρατήρ* etymology<sup>4</sup> is the assumption of a Greco-Latin word

<sup>4</sup> With Isidore, *Etym.* XX, 5, 3, *crater* (> *κρατήρ*) has come under the influence of *cratis*, since he states: "Fiebant autem primum a connexionibus virgularum; unde et dictae craterae ἀπὸ τοῦ κρατεῖν, id est quod se invicem teneant"; similarly he explains *crates* (XIX, 10, 17) "sunt enim connexiones cannarum, ἀπὸ τοῦ κρατεῖν id est quod se invicem teneant" (a parallel late Latin passage with *cratera* "basket" is mentioned by DuCange, s. v. *cratera*). But this obvious misinterpretation does not support the etymology *crater* > OF *graül*. It is a "glossarist's misinterpretation," based on the phonetic assonance of *crater* and *crates* (and of Gr. *κρατεῖν*): it offers no factual information to the effect that goblets were really made of "sprigs, shoots"; had Isidore only thought of *κρατήρ* "mixing vessel" being related to *κεράννυμι* "to mix" (i. e. the "historical," the "real" etymology!), his etymological connection and factual information would have looked quite different. We witness with this writer an encroachment of the "etymologizing" instinct *per se* over the actual etymology: he assigns meanings to words and establishes connections, and then invents facts in order to back them up. For example, there is the famous equation *baiae a baiulandis mercibus*, in which he has invented, for the sake of his etymology, a *baiae* "bay," which is nonexistent and which, up to the time of Meyer-Lübke, had all the Romance etymologists fooled. Compare also the "factual" information given us by Johannes de Garlandia: "*Parapsis* dicitur scutella habens equales angulos etiam a *par*, quod est simile, et *apsis* angulus quasi habent pares angulos," concerning which Schultz (*Das höfische Leben*, I, p. 374) naively suggests "also unseren eckigen Assietten entsprechend"—whereas in reality Johannes de Garlandia bases his wrong etymology (the only right one is: Gr. *παροψις* from *ὄψον*, = Lat. *paropsis* in the Gospel) on fanciful facts invented *ad hoc*. All that may be proved by the transfer of the definition of *crates* to that of *crater* is that the word *crater*, at Isidore's time, was less popular (although it occurs in the Song of Songs: "Umbilicus tuus sicut crater tornatilis") than was *crates*, and, consequently, was attracted into the semantic orbit of the latter.—Medieval tradition has kept the Isidorian mistake alive: in the fifteenth-century Spanish glosses commented on by Castro (*Glosarios latino-españoles de la Edad Media*) we find *crater* "varril de verga" ("a barrel made of withe"), whereas in the French *Abavus* (p. ex. Roques, *Recueil gén. des gloss. fr. du moyen-âge*, I, p. 299) *crater* "hanap" is carefully dis-

which is attested nowhere in Romance *tel quel*, and would appear only in our word-family (with a change of suffix): *\*cratéra* > *\*cratale*. This would be the typical case of a construction *ad hoc*: a parallel word such as the Gr. *character* never underwent the changes supposed to have taken place with *crater* (Sp. *caritel* shows the dissimilation *r-r* > *r-l*, but the *-é-* of the ending is maintained). Diez starts from an attested medieval Latin *cratus* which he assumes to be an alteration of *crater*, and from this *cratus* he derives *graal* (> *\*cratalis*). But again the over-violent Latinization represented by *cratus* seems to me unparalleled in Vulgar Latin: usually Greek nouns with consonantic stem go over to Romance in the accusative form: ἀγκών > It. *ancona*, etc. And, in fact, the *cratus* = κρατήρ, which Diez, following Grimm, thought to have found in the 10th cent. text *Ecbasis captivi*, line 144, is non-existent—although Voigt, in his edition of 1874, repeats Grimm's explanation. In this account the wolf-forester says to the wandering calf: "Tu recreare venis tenuatum corpus ab escis: / Tertius est mensis quod frustror nectare carnis, / Nec biberam cratum pecudis de sanguine tinctum." It seems to me evident that *cratum* is equivalent, not to κρατήρ (is "to drink a *cup* tinged with blood" a natural expression?) but to ἀκρατον "the unmixed, pure, unadulterated wine": *bibera[m]acratum* could be metrically correct, since prevocalic *-m* is subject to elision in Latin verse: the *a-* may have been dropped because of a fusion with the *-a* of *bibera[m]*. Just as the wolf speaks loftily and ironically of the "nectar of meat," he uses the loftier Greek word in place of the more trite

tinguished from *cratis* "clee vel greil" (= claie, gril) and *crates*, *craticula* "greil."

A striking parallel to the (Isidorian and) Helinandian procedure in etymologizing is offered by the translation of the OF *estampie* "dance song and instrumental piece" (> Germ. *stamp-*) into a fantastic Latin *stantipes* in Johannes de Grocheo's musical treatise (ca. 1300): Lloyd Hibberd in *Speculum*, XIX, p. 232 writes on this form: "Grochaeo seems the only person to have used this term, it probably represents his own peculiar rendition of 'estampie' in . . . his 'learned makeshift Latin'."—I would add that to look for loose phonetic and semantic associations when Latinizing a French word not etymologically transparent (*estampie* thus became *estam / pie* and was connected with the phrase *stante pede*, hence the new coinage *stantipes*) is exactly the procedure of Helinandus when he coined a *gradalis* based on *grail*.



Latin *merum* "pure wine," and he paraphrases his blood-thirstiness by a reference to "the pure wine tinged with lamb's blood"—a *contradictio in adjecto*: the hypocrite, in reality, craves pure blood.<sup>5</sup> The wolf is a Grecian humanist, as was his creator, who exhibited his knowledge of Greek in the very title of his tale "*Ecbasis Captivi*." Thus *cratus* = *κρατήρ* must henceforth be expelled from the medieval Latin vocabulary (it is still retained in the *Mittellat. Glossar* of Habel, probably on the basis alone of the *Ecbasis* passage) and replaced by the other hapax (a) *cratum* = *ἄκρατον*.<sup>6</sup>

Thus we must look for a new etymon. The oldest French texts, the *Perceval* of Chrestien and Robert de Boron's *Estoire*, whatever their mutual relationship, can teach us nothing, since, in the first, *un graal, li graax* is an appellative used only for the particular receptacle called the Holy Grail; in the second, the word at first gives the appearance of a proper name—i. e. the name of the book dealing with the Holy Grail (*grant livre qu'en numme le Graal et dit*). According to Foerster (who follows Helinandus), the meaning must have been that of a "grosse und tiefe Schüssel"—something different from an *escüele*. This scholar had already pointed out that the *Atlas linguistique* shows remnants of the OF word in French dialects in Jura, Doubs, Franche-Comté, Haute-Loire on the maps "seau, jatte, auge," and that De Chambure lists it for Morvan (*grô* "vase de forme arrondie et ordinairement creusé dans un petit bloc de bois. Ce vase sert . . . à renfermer la pâte avant la cuisson du pain"). Meyer-Lübke, in the *R. E. W.* article, gives dialectal words with more specific meanings—which should have led him to another etymological explanation: Jura *gregrio*,<sup>7</sup> Bournois *gre* "kleiner

<sup>5</sup> Since *ἀκρατῖς* means also "to breakfast" (cf. also *acratisma* in Lat. glosses), the meaning of our *cratum* = *ἄκρατον* could also be: "I had not any morning drink . . ."—What is the *craticula* "parvus sciphus" found by Diefenbach in a German dictionary?

<sup>6</sup> Diefenbach, s. v. *crater* and *cyathus* has a *cratus* (drawn from a fifteenth century dictionary), which he explains by a contamination of *crater* with *cyathus*. Is this a misspelling of *cyathus*, or is it taken from the *Ecbasis* text?

<sup>7</sup> This form seems to be a kind of reduplication: *gré* + *grial*, evidently due to the desire to avoid the ambiguity of *gré* (> *gratum*, *cratale*), and parallel to the explanatory formations (type *es-mouchette*) which Gilliéron, in his *Abeille*, represented as conditioned by the precarious

Weidenkorb, Eichelnäpfchen," Grand' Combe *gre* "kegelförmiger Korb, in den man den Teig gibt, bevor man ihn in den Ofen schiebt." I may add the Swiss *gré* "panier rond en osier [!] dans lequel on fait lever la pâte d'une miche de pain," which Pierrehumbert lists as synonymous of *vannette*, *bannette* (words derived from Lat. *vannus* and Gaul. *benna*, names of baskets). Why not suppose the meaning "basket" to be the original (thus the Morvan "vase . . . creusé dans un bloc de bois" would be simply the successor of a basket; cf. such transfers as German *Wanne* "tub" from Lat. *vannus* "fan," "winnowing basket")? A *\*cratalis-e*<sup>8</sup> can, accordingly, be derived from Lat. *crātis-ēs* "something woven, plaited, interlaced"—compare the derivatives of *cratis*, *craticius*, *craticula* in Romance (*R. E. W.*, 2302-4): one will note the use of "osier," of the witherod, the flexible material, par excellence, for such baskets. The most primitive receptacle must have been the basket made of flexible branches of "witherod"; later the word was transferred to bowls of wood (the Morvan stage), tin (the *grelet* of Fribourg), still later of silver and other precious materials—and it is in this latter reference that it appears in Chrestien, in Robert de Boron, and in Helinandus. It is no chance that precisely the word family of *cratis* has forms in -z- in Provençal: *grazilha* "grille" = *craticula* (*R. E. W.*, 2303); this fits in excellently with our "grail" words: Prov. *grazal*, Catal. *grasal(a)* *gresal(a)* "cassola, recipient, plat, gibrella" (*Dicc. Alcover*);<sup>9</sup> the Catalan

OF *e(s)* (<*apis*) forms—the "mutilé phonétique" and the victim of a "détresse sémantique," as Gilliéron would say, could only survive in secondary compounds: *esmouchette*, *grégrial*.

<sup>8</sup> We may also point to another derivative: *\*cratellus*, posited by Hebeisen, *Die Bezeichnungen für Geschirr, Eimer, etc.* (Diss. Bern, 1921), p. 39 (who, it is true, holds to the *crater* etymology, p. 47): "*\*Cratalis* ist in Frankreich zu *graal* geworden. *Grio*, *gria gre* [in the Dept Doubs] können nicht auf *\*cratalis*, sondern nur auf *\*cratellus* zurückgehen, d. h. *\*cratalis* ist [in the Dept Doubs] unter dem Einfluss von *sitellus* [Fr. *seau*] in die reichere -*ellus*-Suffixklasse übergetreten." From *greäl* there is a derivative *grelet* in the Swiss dialects defined by Pierrehumbert as "sorte de bol, de coupe ou d'écuelle, généralement en étain" which is first attested in Fribourg in 1409: "Aulcon barbier ne doit . . . lo sang des persones mettre in grelet sus les bans devant hostile" (Godefroy), and is interesting for the connection with blood.

<sup>9</sup> The *grial* of Catalonia, which we will discuss later, was of silver, tin, or earthenware (*majolica* [cf. *Dicc. Aguiló*, s. vv. *malica*, *melica*, *meliça*],

word shows forms with and without *-s*- (just as *grasilla* = *craticula* is found side by side with forms of the *graella* type). As Rohlfs has shown, the Prov. *-z-* occurs in words borrowed from French in the 6th and 7th centuries—a fact which is in line with the Northern French origin of the word *graäl* (as well as of the Grail romance), which Foerster has pointed out. Finally, a *\*cratalia* (plur. neuter) from *crates* has been posited by Vidossich (*R. E. W.*, 2300) for Trieste *graya* “brush-work.” If this etymology could be accepted, our OF *graäl* > *\*crat-alis* would no longer be isolated in Romance.

Thus our word came to lose its etymological transparency, as it changed its reference from “a woven basket” to “a silver bowl” (note the emphasis, with Helinandus, on its “richness”); and *graäl* was phonetically remote from *grille*—hence Helinandus’ fantastic explanations. And, because of this lack of transparency, the French word *grual* must have become archaic already in the standard French of the twelfth century (the French of Chrestien): only thus<sup>10</sup> can we explain the solemn

*terra de Valencia*, etc.). A puzzling form is the *grafal* which is coupled in one of Aguiló’s examples with *escudeles* (*s. v. malica*), as is usual with *gra(s)al*. Is it *grazal* with exchange of spirant (*z* > *f*)? Aguiló has also the adjective *grafallut* “fat, thick” (> “swollen like a bowl”?).

<sup>10</sup> It is this very obsolescence of the word which explains the vagueness, the unvisualizable quality, of its use by Chrestien; and this quality gave a hieratic status to the object, the “thing” (things holy must not be seen at close range). Nitze, in his edition of the prose *Perlesvaus*, note 1, states that the different groups of medieval poets writing on the Grail had distinct vessels in mind: either a chalice or a dish (platter), both of which (the *calix* and the *paropsis* of the Bible) were associated with the vessel of the Paschal Lamb, or the Eucharist. But, according to Blöte, Helinandus contrasted, “critically” and “polemically,” the simple *paropsis* and *catinus* used by Christ in the Gospels, to the “rich” *gradale* or *graäl*. For my part I would hazard the assumption that the emphasis given by Helinandus to the vessel “for the rich” is simply the echo of the OF romances, and that in this literature the “rich” *graäl* is in harmony with the rich appearance of the whole castle of the Grail and its inhabitants: from the moment the grail was entrusted to a family of *knights* the problem of *worldliness* arose: the grail scene in the *Perceval* confronts the poor *nicelot*, who is destined by Grace to become a grail knight, with the rich environment of the fisher-king who in the midst of unheard-of luxury is stricken with grief and sickness and expects redemption from Perceval. Thus the

ring which the word seems to have in its first appearance in literature, and its development in the direction of a proper name; the patois forms listed by Meyer-Lübke reflect a more primitive stage—the pre-Grail semantic stage, as it were. But, were it not for the intervention of the great poets of the Middle Ages, especially of Chrestien (*Tant sainte chose est li graax / Et tant par est espirita . . .*) and Wolfram (*die schüzzel benennet grâl in engelischem dône . . .*), the development of our word would have stopped short: they imagined a scene, as deeply moving as were those of the Gospel which expose the limitations of Christ's disciples, in which an elect believer, who is at the same time a mute witness of miracles, is confronted with the Holy Grail, but is powerless to ask the one all-important question. Thus, as a result of the transformation by poetry, the obsolescent word *graâl* attained the magic splendor with which it shines out of the waves of Wagner's heavenward music, like a supernal numen: "Vom Gral bin ich zu euch dahergesandt . . ." <sup>11</sup> Henceforth

grail must not originally have been a vessel "*quod solet divitibus apponi*"—it became so only in consequence of the *Verritterung* of the grail myth, of the connection of the holy vessel with worldly knighthood. However this may be, it cannot be denied that *graâl* fails to convey any *one clear picture*. And we find much the same situation in the worldlier atmosphere of the Alexander romance; in the version of Venice (edited in *Elliot Monographs*, XXXVI, st. 61-62), we are told of a pilgrim who has been given shelter by a seneschal; his host reports the incident as follows: "Ci voi un pelerin / qui but ersoir a ma cope d'or fin, / E lidonai e pan e car e vin." Then the pilgrim describes the scene in his words: "Ersoir mangai a ton graal"—which might be the equivalent of modern French "hier soir je mangeai à ta table." It is none too clear from the passage whether *mangai a ton graal* refers to the *pan e car*, or whether it may also include the *cope d'or fin . . . e vin*. The exact reference of the word *graâl* was evidently fading out at the time. The evolution in the direction of a proper name, as pointed out by Heinzel in connection with Wolfram's use of *grâl* in German ("der Gral wird zum Eigennamen") starts already in Old French, as Hilka remarks in the commented edition of *Perceval* (ad vv. 3232 and 3299): Chrestien's *li graals qui aloit devant, / li graaus trespasa* (like *la lance passa*) became, in the Elucidation: "Apriés veissiez le graal / Sanz serjant et sanz senescal, / Par l'uis d'une cambre venir / Et mout honestement servir / En rices escueies d'or."

<sup>11</sup> Let us not forget that the German word form *Graal* was charged with all the overtones suggested by phonetic associations in German: in this language such associations as *Strahl* "ray" and *gross* "great"

the word itself is laden with all the gifts of divine Grace, which may gild whate'er it falls upon—even our humble word denoting a rustic basket.<sup>12</sup>

LEO SPITZER.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

help build up the picture of something from which emanates "great splendor." If the form transmitted to the German poets had been, for example, the dialectal Fr. *gré*, the Holy Grail would have lost its radiance in German: "Vom *Gre* bin ich zu euch daher gesandt"??

<sup>12</sup> Since I wrote this article several contributions have appeared which do not invalidate its basic assumptions: 1) A. C. L. Brown's book *Origin of the Grail Legend* (Harvard, 1943); 2) Nitze's review of it in *Mod. Phil.*, XLI, p. 200, in which Brown's etymology of OF *graül*: a Breton parallel to Irish *criol* "basket" or "casket" is rejected while Nitze admits the possibility that "the concept, if not the actual word, is Celtic": the food-giving vessel would then be "not Christian in origin but a hypostasis for a magic, pagan talisman"; 3) A. H. Krappe's article "The Fisher King" in *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, XXXIX, p. 19, in which the kinship of the Grail with marvelous cauldrons attributed to sea divinities not only of the Celts, but also of the ancient Greeks and Scandinavians, is asserted; 4) the article in *P. M. L. A.*, LVIII, p. 597 "A historical background for Chrétien's *Perceval*" by Miss Helen Adolf for whom—unfortunately!—the Grail romance is a "roman à clef" and the Grail banquet, consequently, a replica of a more solemn coronation banquet of Philip Augustus (at which Philip of Flanders, Chrétien's patron, acted as *dapifer*).—I retain from her article the two statements about the extraordinary "sumptuousness displayed at the Fisher King's mansion" (p. 609) and the priority of Chrétien's *Perceval* (where "the Grail is used as a generic name": *un graal*) to Boron's *Joseph*.



## LATIN *dii indigetes*, *dii novensides* AND THE DESIGNATION OF IE KINSHIP.

Latin *indiges* in *dii indigetes* "die einheimischen Götter und Heroen" is generally considered to be a compound with IE *\*endo-* as its first element; the other constituent is supposed to be *-aget-* (: *agere*), or *-ag-e-t-* (: *aio*), or *-getos* (as participle of *gigno*), or *-ugetos* (: *vegeo*), etc.<sup>1</sup> While it is agreed that *in* in *indiges* goes back to IE *\*en*, *\*eni* "in," it is not certain that *indi-* is identical with Latin *indu*, *endo* < IE *\*en* + *\*do*.<sup>2</sup> As no satisfactory explanation of the element following *indi-* has been offered, one might also doubt that *indiges* represents a compound; in this case *indiges* would have to be explained as a derivation of *\*en*, *\*eni* "in."

A derivation of IE *\*en*, *\*eni*, *\*ni*, IE *\*ni-tio-*, Goth. *niþjis*, designates kinship in the IE patriarchal family. On the basis of the expression *di patrii Indigetes*, one might ask the question whether *indiges* is not also a name of kinship. Such an etymology might corroborate the conclusion reached by Koch that the "Stammväterliche" is an essential characteristic of the *Indigetes*.<sup>3</sup>

Names of kinship (or descent) formed upon adverbs (of place) are either compounds having as a first element the adverb and as the other constituent often the root *gene-* "to generate," or derivations out of which IE *\*-t(i)io-* is ancient and common: Skt. *ní-tya-* : *ni-ja*; Goth. *niþjis* : *innakunds*—Skt. *ápa-tya-* : Greek *ἀπόγονος*.<sup>4</sup> While the *\*t(i)io-* derivations are clear, it is difficult to find a satisfactory explanation of *-diget-* in *indiget-es*. One may attempt to analyze the function and meaning of the individual elements, although such a procedure seems, from the very beginning, to lead to rather hypothetical conclusions.

Latin *indi-* in *indiges* (and *indigena*) goes back to *\*endi-*, not to *\*endo-*. *\*endo-* (Greek *ἐνδομύχος*, *ἐνδογενής*, *ἐνδομενία*, *ἐνδο-*v,

<sup>1</sup> Walde-Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, pp. 693 f.

<sup>2</sup> Walde-Hofmann, *op. cit.*, p. 694.

<sup>3</sup> Carl Koch, *Gestirnverehrung im alten Italien* (Frankfurt, 1933), especially pp. 100 ff. I am indebted for this reference to Professor L. R. Taylor.

<sup>4</sup> Schulze, *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 60 ff.

ἐνδότερος) and \*endi- are, according to Vendryes,<sup>5</sup> ancient "thèmes"; the form \*endi-<sup>6</sup> is to be presupposed on the basis of Greek ἐνδῖνα, n. pl., OIrish *inne* < \*endio- "intestines" and of such equations as Greek ἀντίος: ἀντί, ἄπριος: ἄπρι, etc., OIrish *aire* "burden": *air-* "on" < \*pari-, *aithe* "remuneration": *aith-* < \*ati- a particle referring to reciprocity, *imbe* "surroundings": *imb* < \*embi-, etc.<sup>7</sup> A form \*endo- besides \*endio- makes it probable that we have to analyze these words as \*en-d-o- and \*en-d-i-o-.

In the case of \*en-d-o- the element -d- is connected with an adverb; \*en, \*ni in Goth. *niþjis* "kinsman" as well as \*en-d-o- in Greek ἐνδογενής: οἰκογενής<sup>8</sup> refer to the home or family. Similar -d-formations are Greek *φίδιος* "privatus": Skt. *vi* "apart, asunder, away, out"; Greek *νοσφίδιος* "enlevé furtivement": *νόσφι*(ν) "away," "separately," "without"; Greek *διχθάδιος* "double": *διχθά*: *δίχα* "in two; separately; away; without"; Greek *ἁρμόδιος* "harmonious"; *ἁρμόζω* "to adapt": *ἄρποι* "just now."

d-formations frequently occur in words relating to the family or one's own group (e. g. the Greek patronymica and ethnica); these words may single out kinship or a social feature. Such a term is the word "free" (OE *fréowet* "freedom" in contrast to *þéowet* "bondage," both IE -d-io-formations; Church Slavonic *svobodъ*<sup>9</sup> "free, free man"); these OE and Slavic words prove all the more, as similar formations are not frequent in these languages; Gmc. words ending in -assu- referring to social structure like Goth. *fraujinassus*, *þiudinassus*, *skalkinassus*, etc. are similar IE d-formations, although derived indirectly by means of verbs ending in -atjan.

Whatever the origins of the different d-formations are, one important source is the derivation on the basis of an adverb or preposition. The themes \*en-d- "within (the house)" and \*ui-d- "without; separately; asunder; for oneself; away" are ancient. Whereas \*en, \*eni, \*ni (: Skt. *ní-tya-* "own") and \*sue- (: \*sue-krú "mother of the husband") are used for names of the members of the "own" family (of the husband), adverbs like

<sup>5</sup> Vendryes, *M. S. L.*, XV, pp. 358 ff.

<sup>6</sup> See also Specht, *K. Z.*, LXII, pp. 216 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Vendryes, *M. S. L.*, XV, pp. 358 ff.

<sup>8</sup> See note 4.

<sup>9</sup> Lohmann, *Genus und Sexus* (Göttingen, 1932), pp. 75 ff.

IE \**au(e)* (: *avunculus* "brother of the mother") having the meaning "apart, away, separately" serve as basis for naming the "outsider," be it the member of the wife's family or a stranger.

Such a word may be Latin *novensides* in *dii novensides* or *novensiles* "neu-ein-sässige Götter" (< \**nov-en-sides*, Bréal). Instead of linking up *noven-* with *novus* or *novem*, none of which seems to be a satisfactory basis, one might derive *nov-* out of IE \**sen-u-*: Skt. *sanu-tár* "abseits von, weit weg," *sánu-tara-sánu-tya-* "verstohlen, unvermerkt,"<sup>10</sup> Hittite *sanizzi-* (< \**santi-*o-) "good, eminent," Goth. *sundro* "apart; for oneself; especially."<sup>11</sup> Latin *nov-* would then go back to \**snou-* or \**sneu-*; *-en-* may be *-ēn-* out of *-es-n-*; the element *-es-* may be the same as in *in-t-es-tinum*, Skt. *an-t-as-tya-m* "intestines" and *clan-d-es-tinus*.

One might think of analyzing IE \**snusó-* "daughter-in-law" as \**snu-s-o-*, where *snu-* would belong with Skt. *sanu-tár*, etc. The daughter-in-law would, then, be characterized as the woman of the "foreign" family in contrast to the \**sue-krú-*, the mother of the husband and the \**sue-s-ōr*, who are members of the "own" family.

The *novensides* might, on the basis of the etymology presented above, be considered to be the "foreign" gods, the gods who originally were not near to the own group. The *indigetes* are the gods of one's "own" house, family, group. As the IE family system was patriarchal, one ought not stress too much this side in the character of the *indigetes*. This feature is an inherent part of the IE system of relationship. In using the existing system of designation for classifying the *indigetes* as own gods of a certain group, the connotations inherent in the element *ind-*<sup>12</sup> might have influenced the interpretation of the character of the gods.

FRITZ MEZGER.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

<sup>10</sup> Walde-Pokorny, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, I, pp. 494 ff.

<sup>11</sup> Lohmann, *I. F.*, LI, pp. 319 ff.

<sup>12</sup> There is no satisfactory explanation for *-get-*. One may take into consideration as parallels words like *caeles*, *-itis* (*caelestis*) and *seges*, *-etis*, to which belong the two goddesses *Segesta* and *Seia*, which possibly are *g-*derivations from \**sē-* in *semen*, etc.

## THOMAS JEFFERSON AS A PHILOLOGIST (II).

More than half a century ago a note, "Thomas Jefferson as a Philologist," by H. E. Shepherd appeared in the *American Journal of Philology*.<sup>1</sup> Shepherd noted Jefferson's interest in the enrichment of the English language by neologisms and dialect borrowing, drawing his information from a letter of Jefferson to John Adams of August 15, 1820.<sup>2</sup> For analogies Jefferson cited the richness of French, among the modern languages, and of ancient Greek. Of Jefferson's attitude and methods Shepherd says (p. 211), "His comments on the introduction of new words, the changes taking place in the English of his day, the propriety of encouraging neologisms, are delightful as a kind of philological recreation, to say nothing of their accuracy when considered from a scientific viewpoint."

Jefferson had already written to John Waldo, August 16, 1813, on the same theme, saying of the composition of one family of roots with another, "The Greek avails itself of this most abundantly, and beautifully."<sup>3</sup> And later, November 9, 1825, he wrote to J. Evelyn Denison, "I set equal values on the beautiful engraftments we have borrowed from Greece and Rome, and I am equally a friend to the encouragement of a judicious neology; a language cannot be too rich."<sup>4</sup>

As noted by Shepherd, but not discussed by him in detail, Jefferson also wrote an essay on Anglo-Saxon which he sent to Herbert Croft in London. In 1851 this essay was printed by the Board of Trustees of the University of Virginia.<sup>5</sup> But Thomas Jefferson's philological interests went much further than the limits of his own language. He was aware of neologisms in Latin and in a letter to John Adams<sup>6</sup> justified the use of

<sup>1</sup> III (1882), pp. 211-14.

<sup>2</sup> *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, ed. H. A. Washington (Philadelphia, Taylor and Maury, 1853-54), VII, pp. 174-5.

<sup>3</sup> Washington, VI, p. 188.

<sup>4</sup> Washington, VII, p. 418.

<sup>5</sup> *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, ed. A. A. Lipscomb and A. E. Bergh (Washington, Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association of the U. S., 1903), vol. XVIII, pp. 365-411.

<sup>6</sup> September 12, 1821: Washington, VII, p. 219.

*gloriola* by citing Cicero's "*ut nos metipsi vivi gloriola nostra perfruamur.*"<sup>7</sup> He was also interested in the correct pronunciation of Latin and Greek and favored the Italian pronunciation of the former because he thought it logical that the people inhabiting the ancient seat of the Romans would preserve more of the original pronunciation.<sup>8</sup> On no less than five occasions, at intervals over a period of almost forty years, Jefferson expressed the hope that ancient Greek might be revived as the language of the modern Greeks with the conviction that the step could easily be achieved.<sup>9</sup> He discussed some of the changes between ancient and modern pronunciation as follows:

" . . . I have presumed, as an instance of degeneracy, their [i.e. the modern Greeks] ascribing the same sound to the six letters, or combinations of letters, *ε, ι, υ, ει, οι, υι*, to all of which they give the sound of our double *e* in *meet*. This useless equivalence of three vowels and three diphthongs, did not probably exist among the ancient Greeks. . . . I have been more doubtful in the use of *αυ, ευ, ηυ, ου*, sounding the *υ*, upsilon, as for our *f* or *v*, because I find traces of that power of *υ*, or of *υ*, in some modern languages. . . . The modern Greeks themselves, too, giving *υ*, upsilon, in ordinary, the sound of our *ee*, strengthens the presumption that its anomalous sound of *f* or *v*, is a corruption. The same may be inferred from the cacophony of *ελαφνε* (*elavne*) for *ελαυνε* (*elawne*). . . ." <sup>10</sup>

On another phase of the same problem Jefferson has this to say:

"Against reading Greek by accent, instead of quantity, as Mr. Ciccitira proposes, I raise both my hands. What becomes of the sublime measure of Homer, the full sounding rhythm of Demosthenes, if, abandoning quantity, you chop it up by accent? . . . And what becomes of the art of prosody? Is that perfect coincidence of its rules with the structure of their verse, merely

<sup>7</sup> *Ad Fam.*, V, 12, 9. *nos metipsi* is, of course, a mistake for *nosmet ipsi*.

<sup>8</sup> To John Adams, March 21, 1819: Washington, VII, p. 113; to Mr. Moore, September 22, 1819: Washington, VII, p. 137.

<sup>9</sup> *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, ed. P. L. Ford (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1892-1899), IV, pp. 72 and 444; Washington, I, p. 365; V, p. 263; VII, pp. 112-13.

<sup>10</sup> Washington, VII, pp. 113-14. For epsilon, above, Jefferson must have meant eta.



accidental? or was it of design, and yet for no use. . . . Of the origin of accentuation, I have never seen satisfactory proofs. But I have generally supposed the accents were intended to direct the inflections and modulations of the voice; but not to affect the quantity of the syllables."<sup>11</sup>

By frequent self-confession Jefferson showed that he cared little for grammatical rules and terminology, particularly if they ran counter to his sense of the logical and obstructed the free progress of the development of a language. He insisted, therefore, on the existence of the ablative case in ancient Greek of the classical period. He had noted the "*πτωσις αφαιρετικη*" in some of the scholiasts and argued that if the forms were similar to other cases then, by analogy, there was no ablative in Latin plurals. He said, ". . . if every distinct accident or change of relation constitutes a different case, then there are in every language as many cases as there are prepositions. . . . I am contented with the old six cases, familiar to every cultivated language, ancient and modern, and well understood by all. . . . By analyzing too minutely we often reduce our subject to atoms, of which the mind loses its hold."<sup>12</sup>

Since Jefferson was always intensely interested in the conditions of his own time and environment it is not surprising that his philological investigations were directed toward the Indian languages of North America. One American historian, with the lack of completeness and accuracy typical to those of a certain bias, says "He tried to prove that the Creek Indians of Georgia were descendants of the ancient Carthaginians."<sup>13</sup> Jefferson wrote to Edward Rutledge from Paris, July 18, 1788:

"You promise, in your letter of Octob 23. 1787. to give me in your next, at large, the conjectures of your Philosopher on the descent of the Creek Indians from the Carthaginians, supposed to have been separated from Hanno's fleet during his periplus. I shall be very glad to receive them, & see nothing impossible in

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 114-15.

<sup>12</sup> To Edward Everett, February 24, 1823: Washington, VII, pp. 272-3. Cf. a later letter to Mr. Everett, March 27, 1824: Washington, VII, pp. 340-1.

<sup>13</sup> W. E. Woodward, *A New American History* (New York, Farrar & Rinehart Inc., 1936), p. 297.

his conjecture. I am glad he means to appeal to the similarity of language. . . ." <sup>14</sup> During the years of his presidency when nearly all of his much beloved literary pursuits were laid aside for more urgent affairs, Jefferson collected, from various sources, the vocabularies of a number of the Indian dialects. On March 14, 1800, he wrote to Benjamin Hawkins the following:

"I particularly take great interest in whatever respects the Indians, and the present state of the Creeks, mentioned in your letter, is very interesting. . . . I have long believed we can never get any information of the ancient history of the Indians, of their descent and filiation, but from a knowledge and comparative view of their languages. I have, therefore, never failed to avail myself of any opportunity which offered of getting their vocabularies. I have now made up a large collection, and afraid to risk it any longer, lest by some accident it might be lost, I am about to print it. . . . I propose this summer to arrange my vocabularies for the press, and I wish to place every tongue in the column adjacent to it's kindred tongues." <sup>15</sup>

For some reason the printing was delayed and Jefferson's fears of an accident were realized. When Jefferson left Washington and the presidency, the documents on the Indian languages were packed in a trunk and sent to Monticello by way of Richmond and the James and Rivanna rivers. The trunk was heavy—suggesting the possibility of currency to two negro boatmen. They broke open the trunk; the papers were scattered to the four winds.<sup>16</sup> But Jefferson now knew more about the

<sup>14</sup> Ford, V, p. 41.

<sup>15</sup> Ford, VII, pp. 435-7.

<sup>16</sup> W. E. Curtis, *Thomas Jefferson* (Philadelphia and London, J. B. Lipincott Co., 1901), pp. 369-70. Cf. Franklin Edgerton, "Notes on Early American Work in Linguistics," *Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.*, LXXXVII, no. 1 (July 14, 1943), pp. 25-34. Not all the papers were lost since Jefferson presented sixty-eight pages, some damaged and fragmentary, to the Library of the American Philosophical Society. According to Edgerton, p. 29, the library still possesses a few fragmentary manuscripts in Jefferson's own hand in addition to copies made by Du Ponceau of the vocabularies of two Algonquin languages personally recorded by Jefferson. In "The American Indian and the American Philosophical Society," *Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.*, LXXXVI, no. 1 (September, 1942), pp. 189-204, Clark Wissler notes that Jefferson anticipated the modern method of language classification, usually attributed

Indian languages and the suggested origins of Indian tribes from nations of classical antiquity. On May 27, 1813, he wrote to John Adams, "Moreton's deduction of the origin of our Indians from the fugitive Trojans . . . and his manner of accounting for the sprinkling of their Latin with Greek, is really amusing."<sup>17</sup>

Biographers, early and recent, are almost unanimous in acclaiming Thomas Jefferson a great classical scholar. By contemporary evaluation, and in the sense that he was not a professional, it could hardly be said that he was a great classical scholar, or a philologist. But judged by the standards of his times—and this is most certainly what is meant by his biographers—and by the scholarly equipment available, he was, indeed, a philologist in the inclusive meaning of the term. In the broad scope of his enthusiasms for the classical languages, literatures, history and thought, in the scientific method by which he evaluated the classics, he was, potentially, at least, one of the foremost of American philologists.

H. C. MONTGOMERY.

MIAMI UNIVERSITY,  
OXFORD, OHIO.

to the German Schlegel, by a quarter of a century. Even Jefferson was not the first in the field, but Wissler, p. 191, says, "One important point is to note how forehanded was Jefferson in this scientific movement. He seems to have recognized the trend and to have sought to implement research by promoting the collection of materials."

<sup>17</sup> Washington, VI, p. 120.

## THE LATIN BASE OF THE SPANISH SUFFIX *-EÑO*.

There seem to exist three different opinions on the origin of the Spanish suffix *-eño*:

(a) Meyer-Lübke, *Romanische Grammatik*, II, § 509, believed *-ignu* (as present in Lat. *larignus* "of the larch-tree")<sup>1</sup> to underlie Sp. *-eño*, Ptg. *-enho*,<sup>2</sup> and It. *-igno*.<sup>3</sup> So far as Spanish

<sup>1</sup> Actually, *larignus* falls into the stem *laric-* and the suffix *-nus*; cf. *ilignus* "of holm-oak," *salignus* "of willow," involving the stems *ilic-*, *salic-*. The Latin suffix *-nus* (i.e. *-no-*) is transparent in *māter-nus* and also in *acer-nus* "made of maple," *corul-nus* (beside secondary *colur-nus*) "made of the hazel-bush," *quer-nus* "oaken." The hypothesis of Meyer-Lübke is based on the assumption of false separation; its chief argument is the coinage of *abiēgnus* "of fir-wood," recorded as early as Ennius, Plautus, Cato, and Accius (see *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, I, cols. 92-3), on the pattern of similar adjectives in *-ignus*. This explanation has been lately accepted by M. Leumann in Stolz-Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*,<sup>5</sup> p. 221 and by A. Ernout in Ernout-Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*<sup>2</sup>, s. v. The latter classes the variant *abiēgneus* with *iligneus*, *saligneus*, said to be shaped after *ligneus*, and likens *abiegineus* to *fāgineus* "beechen." Apart from *-ignus*, there existed an infrequent termination *-ignus* of various origins: *silignus* "wheaten," a belated variant of *siligineus*, contains the *-igo* element, whereas *benignus*, *malignus* include the verbal *gen* stem, cf. Walde-Hofmann, *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, s. v.

<sup>2</sup> Whether Ptg. *-enho* is a native suffix or due to the diffusion of a Castilian element is an undecided question; compare the cautious statement of J. Leite de Vasconcelos, "Nomes étnicos em português," in *Miscelânea de Estudos em Honra de D. Carolina Michaëlis de Vasconcellos* (Coimbra, 1933), pp. 139-57, particularly pp. 147-8.

<sup>3</sup> Careful perusal of Petrocchi's *Novo dizionario universale* (Milan [1931]) shows that the number of Italian formations registered by Meyer-Lübke, *loc. cit.*, cannot be substantially increased: *-igno* has always been of limited importance as a derivational element. This impression is confirmed by comparison of older rime-dictionaries for Spanish and Italian. Thus, J. Díaz Rengifo, *Arte poética española* (enlarged edition of 1759), p. 273, gives *aguileño*, *barreño*, *carrasqueño*, *cermeño*, *isleño*, *trigueño*, *zahareño*, aside from the words in *-ueño* < *ōneu*, while F. T. Stigliani and P. Colonna, *Arte del verso italiano con le tavole delle rime* (Venice, 1743), pp. 388-9, list only *arcigno*, *cap[r]igno*, *ferrigno*, *sanguigno*. Functionally, It. *-igno* and Sp. *-eño* differ in various respects: the former often serves to modify the degree of a quality, mostly the intensity of a color (*aspr-igno*, *azzur-igno*, *bass-igno*,

is concerned, this theory was adhered to by Hanssen<sup>4</sup> and reiterated by its author in later years.<sup>5</sup> Subsequently Meyer-Lübke

*giall-igno, ross-igno, verd-igno*), the latter is normally attached to the name of a substance to derive the corresponding adjective. The Italian suffix is occasionally added on to the name of an animal: *capr-igno, lup-igno, volp-igno*; in the Hispanic languages -uno, extracted from *aprū(g)nus*, is used in this capacity: *abejuno, boyuno, conejuno, gatuno, jabaluno* (see *Boletín de la Academia Española*, I [1914], pp. 69-70), *lebruno, lobuno, ovejuno, perruno, raposuno, vacuno, zorruno*, beside -ío < -ivu: *cabrío, -ar: caballar, mular*, and quite infrequently -eño: *aguileño*. Common to the two languages is the vacillation between -ino and -eño (-igno): cf. It. *azzurino, caprino* beside *azzurigno, caprigno* (this would account for the coinage of *alpigno* beside *alpino*), and Sp. *aquilino* (Santillana, Lope de Vega, L. Moratín) alongside *aguileño* (*Coplas de Mingo Revulgo*, Lope de Vega), *aguileño* (Comendador Núñez, *Libros de Caballerías*, Castillejo, Osuna) and *azulino* (*Historia de Morgante*, Suárez de Figueroa) alongside *azuleño* (Bails).

<sup>4</sup> Federico Hanssen, *Gramática histórica de la lengua castellana* (Halle, 1913), p. 139. The author included *pequeño* in the number of pertinent formations, unaware of the phonological difficulties presented by its Portuguese cognate *pequeno*.

<sup>5</sup> For instance, in *Einführung in das Studium der romanischen Sprachwissenschaft*<sup>3</sup> (Heidelberg, 1920), p. 279, and in previous editions of this book. Meyer-Lübke does not seem to have given thought to the possibility of discovering congeners to -eño as far east as Rumania. Rumanian has a suffix -ean, occurring in words like: *apusean* "western," *câmpean* "rural," *codrean* "related to a forest," *găurean* "dwelling in a valley," *josean* "dwelling in a lowland," *muntean* "dwelling in the mountains," *orașan* "city dweller," *pământean* "earthly," *popor(e)an* "popular," *răsăritean* "eastern," *riurean* "dwelling near a river," *sătean* "villager," and so forth; it is likewise present in untold derivatives from names of cities designating their inhabitants; see G. Pascu, *Sufixele românești* (Bucarest, 1916), pp. 302-5 and K. Löwe, "Die Adjektivsuffixe im Dakoromanischen," in *Siebzehnter und achtzehnter Jahresbericht des Instituts für rumänische Sprache zu Leipzig*, ed. G. Weigand (Leipzig, 1911), pp. 37-8. The counterpart of this suffix is extant in Macedo-Rumanian, too, as has been demonstrated by Th. Capidan, "Die nominalen Suffixe im Aromunischen," in *Fünfzehnter Jahresbericht* (Leipzig, 1909), pp. 35-6. The aforementioned scholars are all agreed that -ean is traceable to Old Church Slavonic (and partially to Middle Bulgarian), as was previously claimed by H. Tiktin, *Rumänisches Elementarbuch* (Heidelberg, 1905), p. 113. In view of the noted semantic resemblance between -ean and -eño and also of the frequent mergers of Latin and Slavic formative elements, students of Rumanian are likely some day to concede that -ean may be a fusion of OCSl. *ěnz* and Lat. *ineu*.



furnished evidence of the existence of *-eny* in Catalan;<sup>6</sup> he pointed out the presence of a reflex of *-ignu* in Catalan and its absence from Provençal as a significant structural difference between the two languages.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> W. Meyer-Lübke, *Das Katalanische: seine Stellung zum Spanischen und Provenzalischen* (Heidelberg, 1925), pp. 96, 157: Cat. *areny*, *ferreny*, *terreny* are adduced as evidence. A. Alonso makes no reference to these statements in his extensive discussion of the book ("La subagrupación románica del catalán," in *Revista de Filología Española*, XIII [1926], pp. 1-38).

<sup>7</sup> Meyer-Lübke's statement, which incidentally fails to support his main theory of close relationship between Catalan and Provençal, is subject to caution. In original Catalan formations *-eny* seems to function as a substantival suffix, which it rarely does in Castilian; for illustrations, see J. Huber, *Katalanische Grammatik* (Heidelberg, 1929), p. 203. In Old Catalan there is little, if any, evidence of the existence of *-eny* as a separate productive suffix, although it may possibly be found in scattered relics. Thus, in the mediaeval *Diccionari de Rims de Jaume March*, ed. A. Grieria (Barcelona, 1921), twenty-five words terminating in *-eny* are given (lines 1282-1286), yet none of them contains the suffix in question. It is further noteworthy that the dialect of Valencia, admittedly affected by a strong infiltration of Castilianisms, has numerous formations in *-eny*, obviously imported at a late date from the center of the peninsula. Thus, L. Fullana Mira, *Vocabulari ortogràfic valencià-castellà* (Valencia, 1921) contains entries like *agreceny*, *aguileny*, *almiçcleny*, *berroqueny*, *carrasqueny*, which have been rigorously excluded by the purists from standard Catalan, see Pompeu Fabra, *Diccionari ortogràfic*<sup>2</sup> (Barcelona, 1923). It would be interesting to find out to what extent the scarcity of native *-eny* in Catalan territory is counterbalanced by the exuberant growth of competing adjectival suffixes like *-ivol* < *-ibilis* and particularly *-enc*.

In terms of linguistic geography it is further significant that in Old Aragonese there is hardly more than vestigial evidence of *-enyo*. Careful perusal of "Inventarios aragoneses de los siglos XIV y XV," ed. M. Serrano y Sanz, *Boletín de la Academia Española*, II (1915), pp. 85-97, 219-24, 341-52, 548-59; III (1916), pp. 89-92, 224-5, 359-65; IV (1917), pp. 206-23, 342-55, 517-31 yielded a very meager result indeed: *camenya* "camastro" (II, p. 559; III, pp. 90, 360; IV, pp. 220, 221, 347, 353, 525) and its derivative *camenyal* (III, pp. 90, 224) are of little avail as long as the origin of *cama* remains unknown (see *Roman. Etym. Wtb.*<sup>3</sup>, 1537); otherwise only *taulas portalenyas de pino* (IV, p. 347) and not quite transparent *curuenya de ballesta* (IV, pp. 347, 522) were encountered. No material at all was found in *Fueros de Aragón*, ed. G. Tilander. It is justified, then, to consider *-eño* as peculiar to the Castilian dialect rather than to the Hispanic languages.

(b) J. Alemany based his theory of Sp. -eño < -ineu on one concrete case, to wit the derivation of *estameña* "serge" from *staminea*.<sup>8</sup> According to him, Spanish words like *almizcleño* "musky," *borriqueño* "asinine," *cobreño* "made of copper," *guijeño* "full of pebbles," *peceño* "pitchy" (including numerous derivatives from names of cities and countries) showed an extension of the original use of -ineu, except for the three words *aceña* "water-mill," *cenceño* "lean, slender," also "simple, pure" (*pan cenceño* "unleavened bread"), and *takeño* "having a red beard," traceable to Arabic etyma.

(c) Quite recently, J. H. D. Allen, Jr. was inclined to endorse the opinion of J. J. Nunes, to the effect that Ptg. -enho "was formed by adding -eus to -ēnus in Vulgar Latin."<sup>9</sup> The chief argument of Allen was the spread of -āneu and -ōneu, congeners to \*-ēneu, in the Romance languages.<sup>10</sup>

Our contention is that of the three explanations so far offered the second should be accepted as correct. Students of Romance are no longer willing to take into account hypothetical bases, unless convincing evidence can be produced that such bases were not only apt, but extremely likely to have arisen in spoken Latin. The weak point of the etymology of Nunes-Allen is that -ēneus is recorded in a single (and in all likelihood secondary) formation, viz. *a(h)ēneus* "brazen, of (the color of) bronze," which

<sup>8</sup> J. Alemany Bolufer, *Tratado de la formación de palabras en la lengua castellana* (Madrid, 1920), reprinted from *Boletín de la Academia Española*, pp. 56-57. There is a casual reference to the derivation -eño < -ineu in P. Förster, *Spanische Sprachlehre* (Berlin, 1880), p. 214. In retracing *almadreña* to *\*materinea*, V. García de Diego, *Elementos de gramática histórica española* (Burgos, 1914) expressly discards the theory of Meyer-Lübke.

<sup>9</sup> J. H. D. Allen, Jr., *Portuguese Word-Formation with Suffixes* (supplement to *Language*, XVII [1941]), §§ 51, 123; on this monograph, see *Language*, XVIII (1942), pp. 51-62. Reference is made to J. J. Nunes, *Compêndio de Gramática Histórica Portuguesa*<sup>2</sup> (Lisbon, 1930).

<sup>10</sup> On -ōneu in Portuguese (as present in *dizonho*, *enfadonho*, *guardonho*, *medonho*, [ne]gronho, *palronho*, *pedigonho*, *risonho*, *tristonho*) see various statements by C. Michaëlis de Vasconcelos: in *Miscellanea Caix-Canello* (1885), pp. 113-66, s. v. *medronho*; in *Revista Lusitana*, I, pp. 301-3; III, pp. 130, 133, 168-9. On -āneu as present in *sōlitāneus*, see the writer's "Old French Soutif 'Solitary,'" in *Modern Language Quarterly*, III (1942), pp. 621-46.

failed to survive in Romance.<sup>11</sup> The theory of Meyer-Lübke and Hanssen, on the other hand, must be rejected because these scholars were unable to quote a single clear-cut case in which Lat. *-ignus* corresponds to a documented Hispanic word,<sup>12</sup> and also because the archaic combination *-ignus*, within the limits of recorded Latinity, showed symptoms of decline rather than of promising development.<sup>13</sup> By way of contrast, Alemany's suggestion was from the outset based on at least one transparent case. It remains to supply abundant additional evidence of its correctness and to define the rôle that *-ineus* actually played in Latin word-formation.<sup>14</sup>

A generation ago, J. Schwede, under the guidance of F. Skutsch, wrote a careful study on Latin adjectives serving to express a substance and derived by means of the suffixes *-no-* and *-eo-*.<sup>15</sup> The results of this study have been largely incorporated by M. Leumann in his outline of Latin morphology.<sup>16</sup> On the basis of these two sources it is possible to state that there have existed in Latin, from Ennius down to Venantius Fortunatus, at least thirty derivatives in *-ineus*:<sup>17</sup>

<sup>11</sup> *A(h)ēneus* is usually accounted for as a contamination of *a(h)ēnus* by *-eus*. On details of the usage, see *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, I, cols. 1444-6 (Bickel): *ahēnus* and *ahēneus* appear to have been employed interchangeably in the republican Latinity; *aeneus* is more recent, incident to prose and poetry alike; the use of *aenus* is restricted to poetry. Note substantival *aena*, *-ae* corresponding in glosses to λέβης.

<sup>12</sup> *Roman. Etym. Wtb.*<sup>3</sup>, 9383 does show scattered reflexes of *vītig(e)-nus* in Italian and Raeto-Romance (Surselvan). In these relics the suffix is no longer analyzable.

<sup>13</sup> This can be deduced from forms like *iligneus*, *saligneus* (comparable to *ficulneus*, *pōpulneus*, *querneus* and usually explained as due to a cross of *-no-* and *-eo-*).

<sup>14</sup> The ending *-ineus* must be carefully distinguished from (infrequent) *-ineus* as seen in *fēlineus*, a variation upon *fēlinus* found in Late Latin (e.g. in Servius as well as in glosses and in scholia).

<sup>15</sup> J. Schwede, *De adiectivis materiem significantibus quae in prisca Latinitate suffixorum -no- et -eo- ope formata sunt* (Diss. Univ. of Breslau, 1906).

<sup>16</sup> Stolz-Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*<sup>5</sup>, pp. 205-6.

<sup>17</sup> Derivatives from proper names like *Apollineus*, *Cupidineus* have not been taken into consideration. It will be observed that Spanish has absorbed *-ineo* as a learned suffix, cf. *abietíneo*, *aceríneo*, *albugíneo*, *apolíneo*, *arundíneo*, *broncíneo*, *fulmíneo*, *gramíneo*, *sanguíneo*, *virgíneo*. In this

1. <i>abiegineus</i>	made of fir-wood
2. <i>albineus</i>	whitish
3. <i>angineus</i>	serpent-like
4. <i>auri-, aurūgineus</i>	jaundiced
5. <i>caligineus</i>	gloomy
6. <i>cartilāgineus</i>	gristly
7. <i>cērineus</i>	wax-colored
8. <i>cocc(h)ineus</i>	scarlet
9. <i>cōnsanguineus</i>	related by blood
10. <i>*fabāgineus &gt; fabāginus</i>	of beans
11. <i>fāgineus</i>	beechen
12. <i>farrāgineus</i>	relating to mixed fodder
13. <i>fēmineus</i>	womanly
14. <i>ferrūgineus</i>	of the color of iron-rust
15. <i>flūmineus</i>	belonging to a river
16. <i>fūlgineus</i>	sooty
17. <i>(h)arundineus</i>	reedy
18. <i>imāgineus</i>	image-like
19. <i>lactineus</i>	milk-colored
20. <i>lanūgineus</i>	woolly, downy
21. <i>oleāgineus</i>	resembling an olive(-tree)
22. <i>pampineus</i>	having tendrils
23. <i>siligineus</i>	wheaten
24. <i>similāgineus</i>	pertaining to the whitest wheat flour
25. <i>stamineus</i>	thready, fibrous
26. <i>tēstūdineus</i>	made of tortoise-shell
27. <i>tiliāgineus</i>	of linden-wood
28. <i>vimineus</i>	made of wicker-work
29. <i>virgineus</i>	maidenly
30. <i>vīti(gi)neus</i>	produced by the vine

In terms of morphology, the majority of these adjectives do not differ fundamentally from others in *-eus* like *adōr-eus*, *aescul-eus*, *bux-eus*, *cēr-eus*, *corn-eus*, *faec-eus*, *ferr-eus*, *flamm-eus*, *flōr-eus*, *herb-eus*, *ign-eus*, *iunc-eus*, except that *-eus* happens to be added on either to an *-n* stem or to a derivative in *-āgo*, *-īgo*, or *-ūgo*.<sup>18</sup> Yet in a few words vestiges of a subsequent process

function *-ineo* suffered from the rivalry of *-ino* rather than of *-eño*: cf. *abietīneo* beside *abietino* (Fragoso, *Discurso de las cosas aromáticas and Cirugía*, ed. 1600), *acerīneo* beside *acerino* (Rufo, *Los Apotegmas*); older formations include *albugīneo* (Montaña, *Anatomía*, ed. 1551 and Gordonio, *Medicina*); *apolīneo* (R. Alarcón, *Argensola*, Meléndez Valdés); *arundīneo* (M. Avila; Covarrubias, *Tesoro*, s. v. *báculo*). With a different stress pattern *-ineo* appears in feminine proper names like *Dulcinea*, *Florinea*, which had a vogue during the Renaissance: they appear to have been modelled after *fēminea*, *virginea*.

The accentual pattern of the related suffix *-ino* also presents a problem inasmuch as this suffix perpetuates both Lat. *-inus* and *-in-*; see J. Alemany Bolufer, *op. cit.*, pp. 84-6.

<sup>18</sup> On the survival of these suffixes in Ibero-Romance, see A. Steiger, "Sobre algunas voces que significan 'hollín' en las lenguas románicas,"

of false separation, entailing the genesis of a new suffix *-ineus*, are clearly visible. Because, for instance, in the word *ferrūgo* the straight case seemed to suggest a *ferrūg*-stem, while the oblique case posited *ferrūgin*-, it was possible for *ferrūgine-eus* to be misinterpreted as *ferrūg-ineus*. This separation led to the combination of *-in*- and *-eus*, two hitherto entirely unrelated and independent elements, into the new unit *-ineus*, as appearing in *cēr-ineus*, *fāg-ineus*. The next (and ultimate) phase was the segregation of *-gineus*, resulting in the coinage of *oleā-gineus*, *tiliā-gineus*, and the like.

In view of the technical connotation of the overwhelming majority of the formations (except for *fēmineus*, *virgineus*, which stand also apart in their reference to human beings), it is hardly surprising that roughly one half of them should be recorded only once or twice in Roman literature.<sup>19</sup> It is further quite natural that they should occur preëminently in authors concerned with agriculture, rural life, and botany such as Cato, Columella (whose testimony is significant because he was a

in *Homenaje a R. Menéndez Pidal*, II, pp. 35-48 (Madrid, 1925); V. García de Diego, "Divergentes latinos," *Revista de Filología Española*, V, pp. 133-42; *idem*, *Contribución al diccionario hispánico etimológico* (Madrid, 1923), pp. 15-19 (*aerūgo*) and 178-84 (*vorāgo*). Also consult the writer's "The Suffix *-āgo* in Astur-Leonese-Galician Dialects," *Language*, XIX (1943), pp. 256-8; to the formations there quoted which survived in Romance and are recorded in *Roman. Etym. Wtb.* add: *fustāgo* (3614); *impetīgo* (4306); *runcāgo* (7443a); *serpīgo* (7558); *sōlāgo* (8061).

<sup>19</sup> On the rare formations, *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (A-I) and Georges' *Ausführliches lateinisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*<sup>8</sup> give the following information: *abiegineus* is recorded *C. I. L.*, I, 577; *albineus* occurs in Palladius; *aurigineus* beside *aurūgineus* has been found in medical literature (Caelius Aurelianus, translations of Galen), with variants in *-geneus* suggesting contamination by the *gen*-stem; *caligineus* is known from Grattius; *cartilāgineus*, from Pliny; *cērineus* is found in *Carmina epigraphica*, ed. F. Bücheler, in a poem composed "saeculo II ineunte," according to Götz; *fabāginus* has been used by Cato; *fūligineus*, by Petronius and Arnobius; *imāgineus* appears in Sedulius and Venantius Fortunatus; *lactineus* is proper only to the latter; *lanūgineus* occurs in Pseudo-Apuleius; *similāgineus*, in the Vulgate; *tiliāgineus*, in Columella. Of considerable interest from the point of view of Romance is the occasional use of substantival plural formations like *flūminea*, *tēstūdineu*.



native of Spain), and Pliny,<sup>20</sup> also in bucolic poetry and related genres,<sup>21</sup> and should, conversely, be almost entirely lacking in the writings of historians, orators, and moralists. Attention must be drawn to two outstanding facts: (1) *-ineus* was in existence in the earliest literature,<sup>22</sup> so that its perpetuation in Spanish would be in harmony with the prevailing notion of the distinctly archaic character of the Ibero-Romance lexicon;<sup>23</sup> (2) *-ineus* was not extinct in late Latin, as can be inferred from the appearance of some words (e. g. *imagineus*, *lactineus*, *similagineus*) in the Vulgate and even in Sedulius and Venantius Fortunatus.

*Stamineus* was incidentally not the only derivative in *-ineus* which survived in Romance: the *Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* lists products of *silagineus* (7916) in the dialects of Verona and Brescia; furthermore, Sp. *cimbreño* may be an outgrowth of *vimineus* (9336), if we accept with Meyer-Lübke the theory of a cross of *vimen* with *cingere*; finally, Sp. *cereño* may be an organic perpetuation of *cérineus*.

How can the proposed etymology *-eño* < *-ineu* be integrated in the general picture of Romance word-formation? When *-eus* and *-ius* ceased to be available as productive adjectival suffixes,<sup>24</sup> they were replaced by compound endings (so-called suffix-chains) which, in the perspective of Romance, had the dual advantage of being, semantically, more expressive and, rhythmically, accentuated. Thus in the territory of Gaul *-aricius* and *-āceus* firmly entrenched themselves.<sup>25</sup> These combinations are known

<sup>20</sup> Aside from the foregoing words, *fāgineus* is found in Cato; *oleāgineus* in Cato, Varro, Columella, Pliny; *sitāgineus* in Cato, Varro, Pliny; *vitigineus* in Cato, Columella, Pliny.

<sup>21</sup> Incident to the lexicon of Tibullus, Vergil, Ovid, Propertius are *anguineus*, *harundineus*, *pampineus*, *vimineus*, *virgineus*.

<sup>22</sup> *Cōsanguineus* occurs in Plautus, Pacuvius, Accius; *ferrūgineus* in Plautus, Lucretius; *tēstūdineus* in Plautus.

<sup>23</sup> On the comparatively early date of the Romanization of the Iberian peninsula, see, in addition to the older literature, W. v. Wartburg, *Die Entstehung der romanischen Völker* (Halle, 1939), pp. 26-46.

<sup>24</sup> A. Thomas, "La dérivation à l'aide des suffixes vocaliques atones," in *Essais de philologie française* (Paris, 1897), pp. 74-91.

<sup>25</sup> A. Thomas, "Le suffixe *-aricius*," in *Nouveaux essais de philologie française* (Paris, 1905), pp. 62-110, 359-62; Ernst Gamillscheg, "Grundzüge der galloromanischen Wortbildung," in Gamillscheg-Spitzer, *Beiträge zur romanischen Wortbildungslehre* (Geneva, 1921).

to have originated through false separation. In other words, the process described here as underlying the segregation in Latin of *-ineus* and its penetration into Spanish exactly parallels the development of similar Gallo-Romance suffixes.<sup>26</sup>

It cannot be our concern here to trace the further growth of *-eño* in Spanish. Suffice it to say that in this language (in contrast to Portuguese, Catalan, and Italian), a distinct stylistic value began to accrue to the product of *-ineu* from the late 16th century, when a group of leading writers turned away from Latinization, deciding to bestow new dignity on the vernacular resources of word-formation.<sup>27</sup> The Golden Age presumably marks the climactic point in the history of *-eño*; subsequently, numerous derivatives coined in that period fell into oblivion.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Striking is the resemblance between the development of *-(at)iceu* in Gaul and in Spain. The Spanish type *acogedizo*, *achacadizo*, *advenedizo*, *afogadizo*, *agachadizo*, *ahogadizo*, *ahorcadizo*, *alborotadizo*, *alevantadizo*, *alquiladizo*, *allegadizo*, *andadizo*, *anegadizo*, *apagadizo*, *apartadizo*, *apegadizo*, *apertadizo*, *arrastradizo*, *arrebatadizo*, *arrobadizo*, *arrojadizo*, *aserradizo*, *asomadizo*, *asombradizo*, *asustadizo*, *atajadizo*, and the like (for illustration, see vol. I of *Diccionario Histórico*) is exactly paralleled by Old French *-ëiz*. The difference between the two languages consists only in that there are no traces in Spanish of *-adizo* serving to express a reiterated action, as *-ëiz* frequently does, and that in turn French does not appear to know the combination *-iceu* and *-île* (Sp. *-izal*).

<sup>27</sup> See the writer's "The *amulado* Type in Spanish," in *Romanic Review*, XXXII, pp. 278-95.

<sup>28</sup> Instances of the use of *-eño* in Old Spanish are extremely rare; even where one would most certainly expect to find it, as in "Unos aranceles de aduanas del siglo XIII," ed. A. Castro, *Revista de Filología Española*, VIII, pp. 1-29, 325-56; IX, pp. 266-76; X, pp. 113-36, it turns out to be absent. Notice *Alex. P 1504b pedreñal* "variedad de cuarzo" as against O 1362b *pedernal*, as quoted by J. Keller, *Contribución al vocabulario del Poema de Alixandre* (Madrid, 1932), s. v.; and *cardeño* in D. Juan Manuel, *El libro de la caza*, ed. G. Baist (Halle, 1880), p. 10, line 15, a modification of *cardinus* "of the color of a thistle" (*Roman. Etym. Wtb.*<sup>3</sup>, 1682). In his grammar, published in Salamanca in the year 1492, Nebrija not only recorded *-eño* as a derivational element present in words like *extrem-eño*, *cacer-eño*, *alcantar-eño*, *marmol-eño*, *sed-eño*, but, significantly enough, visualized the spread of the suffix to other stems, stating in reference to *guadalup-eño*, *merid-eño* which were not yet in current use at that time: "Aunque luego en el comienço esta derivacion parezca aspera, el uso la puede hazer blanda e suave"; see Nebrija, *Gramática de la lengua castellana*,

Since that literary epoch largely coincides with the years of intensive discovery, conquest, exploration, and colonization in the New World, there is little wonder that -eño should be so plentifully represented in Spanish-American toponymy.<sup>29</sup>

YAKOV MALKIEL.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

ed. J. González-Llubera (Oxford University Press, 1926), p. 81. So far as peninsular place-names are concerned, -eño is employed pre-eminently when the preceding syllable contains an *a*: cf. *alcala-eño*, *alcarac-eño*, *alcarr-eño*, *alcazar-eño*, *almagr-eño*, *alpujarr-eño*, *andujar-eño*, *argand-eño*; cities lending themselves to this derivation are found in the center and especially in the south of the country, that is, in areas reconquered in the late Middle Ages, which would point to a recent expansion of the suffix (in northern territory, -és prevails; compare *aragonés*, *burgalés*, *leonés* with *extremeño*). In Latin American place-names, -eño has taken the lead without regard to the stem vowel: *panameño*, *hondureño*, *salvadoreño*, *costarriqueño*, also *abajeño*, *isleño*, *costeño*. This unqualified use is another step in the progress of the suffix. Documented illustration of the extension of -eño is found in the *Diccionario Histórico: abrileno* (Gabriel y Galán), *agraceño* (G. Herrera), *aguijeño* (Nebrija), *agujeño* (19th century), *alcornoqueño* (Cervantes), *almizcleño* (Lope de Vega, Suárez de Figueroa); a complete list of the derivatives registered in the dictionaries of the Academy will be found in the pertinent chapter of Benot's *Diccionario de asonantes y consonantes*. Some rare formations have been collected by F. Rodríguez Marín, *Dos mil quinientas voces castizas y bien autorizadas que piden lugar en nuestro léxico* (Madrid, 1922): *acereño* (Lucena); *cari-trigueño* (*Romancero General*); *cereño* (Barahona de Soto); *galguereño* (*idem*); *mancheño* (Castellanos); *marismeño* (Ávila); *pastureño* (Barahona de Soto); *patinuleño* (Oudin, Pedro de Aguilar); *toboseño* (Documents of the years 1536, 1604). On the spread of -eño, consult G. Sachs, "La formación de los gentilicios en español," *Revista de Filología Española*, XXI, pp. 393-99.

The number of words in -eña, -eño absorbed from Arabic is higher than has been estimated by J. Alemany; cf. *Alcarceña*, *alheña*, *alhuceña* as interpreted by *Diccionario Histórico*. An interesting hybrid form is *almadreña* "zueco, zapato de madera" (*Ordenación de Burgos*; Villarroel).

<sup>29</sup> Compare with -ineu > -eño the development (epi)scynium > Sp. (*sobre*)ceño, Ptg. (*sobre*)cenho as explained by Baist and Meyer-Lübke (*Roman. Etym. Wtb.*<sup>3</sup>, 9656).

## ON THE UNITY OF THE *MILES GLORIOSUS*.

G. E. Duckworth's article on the structure of the *Miles Gloriosus* had as its chief purpose the refutation of Jachmann's arguments on the subject in his *Plautinisches und Attisches*, and in that it was successful.<sup>1</sup> It also contains a goodly number of sensible and judicious remarks aimed at the interpretation of the play. Since it is the latest discussion of the subject, we may say that the state of the question is now as follows: (1) Leo's theory that the play has two chief models has been challenged more than once (see the bibliography given by Duckworth), but still has its supporters; (2) Fränkel's theory that the Lucrio scene (III, 2) comes from a third model is pretty generally accepted, and has perhaps, as Jachmann notes, tended to alienate some of the support of Leo's theory. Jachmann intended to support both Leo and Fränkel.

The supporters of Leo's theory have lately rested their case on two key points, since they have been driven from all their minor outlying positions. They insist that those who support the unity of the play must give a satisfactory account of Act III, scene 1, and of Palaestrio's warning to Pleusicles in 805 ff. not to address the girl as Philocomasium. Drexler has given a good explanation of the first point, the difficulties at the beginning of the third act, and this seems to be accepted by Duckworth.<sup>2</sup> I shall only say that the second trick seems to me to grow naturally out of the first, and that the long passage in which Periplectomenus expatiates on his own character is apropos as a neat justification for a middle-aged man's taking part in such youthful doings.

My purpose is to offer an explanation of 805 ff. and the Lucrio scene which will end in the conclusion that neither Leo's theory of two models nor Fränkel's theory that the Lucrio scene comes from a third model can be maintained. The explanation rests on the assumption that Palaestrio prepared against the most likely mischances when setting his second trick in operation.

<sup>1</sup> "The Structure of the *Miles Gloriosus*," *Class. Phil.*, XXX (1935), pp. 228-46. He gives the bibliography of the question.

<sup>2</sup> "Zur Interpretation des Plautinischen *Miles*," *Hermes*, LXIV (1929), pp. 339-75; Duckworth, *op. cit.*, p. 231, n. 15.

Palaestrio's warning in 805 ff. is regarded as a difficulty by Drexler, but he suggests that perhaps the lines were inserted by Plautus to relieve the anxiety of the audience about the imminent return of the soldier, apparently believing that the lines imply that the hole-in-the-wall trick is to be tried on the soldier.<sup>3</sup> Duckworth suggests that Palaestrio is warning Pleusicles that in his coming rôle of ship captain he must be careful to give the supposed twin sister the same name she had in Act II.<sup>4</sup> "In this case the instructions to which Palaestrio refers in 810 are the same instructions which he later gives Pleusicles in 1175 ff." But as the text stands, he is not told simply to give the twin sister the same name as before, but to use that name instead of Philocomasium, and the instructions in 1175 make no reference to the sister.

I believe that the following interpretation will raise no difficulties. Palaestrio had discussed the rôles of Acroteleutium and Milphidippa with them, and that part of the trick was ready to begin at any time and with excellent chances of success. The prudent thing to do at this point was to tighten the joints of the trick, so to speak, by preparing against predictable mischances. The first predictable mishap would be a meeting between Pleusicles and Philocomasium which would lead him to address her by name. If the soldier should hear her called by name by a stranger when she was as far from home as Ephesus, even he might suspect that a rival was on hand and balk at letting her go. Possibly she would be on her way out with her baggage when Pleusicles arrived as captain to summon her. Of course it would be all right to say at the door as he was instructed to do that she must come or to address her by name if she came out to go with him and were thus identified, but a chance meeting before such identification might lead him to address her by her name and arouse suspicion. If he addressed her as Dicea and was corrected, it would only reënforce the notion that her identical twin was newly arrived with her mother, which would be somewhat helpful. The main thing was to remember not to blurt out her real name when he was not expected to know her. To have explained why at this time would have entailed a rather awkward exposition of the whole trick, which is actually ex-

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 368, n.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 231-2.



plained as it unfolds at a brisk pace. No explanation is given later because everything goes as planned, which obviously does not justify the argument that it was useless to take this precaution. When he comes he does not find her outside or coming out, but has to call to her to hurry, as planned. He is in command of himself, nothing unexpected happens, and he makes no slips; it still was a good idea to warn him against the chief mistake he might have made, for Palaestrio is represented as a careful planner elsewhere in the play and should uphold that reputation here. Pleusicles does arouse the soldier's possessiveness by hugging Philocomasium, to be sure, but not suspicions that he knew her of old. Actually we have an exciting riskiness in the action; the other mistake would either ruin everything or require oceans of words to mend it.

This passage might be called an instance of false preparation, since there is nothing later in the play to fulfil the expectation it arouses. This criticism would be beside the mark, since the audience would in the first place have the pleasure of seeing Palaestrio do a workmanlike job by forestalling a mishap; in the second place the mind of the audience would not be further distracted by the expectation of any mishap of this sort, and in the third place if the expectations aroused by this passage were fulfilled, that would only mean that Pleusicles addressed Philocomasium as Dicea as he was told to do, which would have no value as drama.

The Lucrio scene (III, 2) has the same purpose. Palaestrio wants to know where Sceledrus is. To be sure, Sceledrus has been convinced that he would be mad to accuse Philocomasium, and that he must have seen her twin sister. Human nature being as it is, it was almost inevitable that if he saw the soldier he would touch the sore place, so to speak, by making some remark about the twin sister next door, and the chances would be pretty good that he would end up by giving away the whole story of what he had seen and what had happened thereafter. Palaestrio intended next to forestall this possibility and called for Sceledrus. From there on the action moves, as it seems to me, with a delicate precision which is pretty to watch.

Out comes Lucrio; Palaestrio learns that Sceledrus is out of the way for at least a couple of hours. Lucrio, however, has been with him ever since he went in after the hole-in-the-wall

trick, and there has been drinking; therefore Lucrio may have heard the story. Palaestrio immediately starts putting Lucrio in the wrong, and presently threatens him with exposure for his part in the "bacchanal." This has the desired effect, and Lucrio plans to hide out for a while but remembers an errand. Palaestrio asks where he is going and he says that Philocomasium has sent him on an errand. Palaestrio tells him to come back immediately, still with the threatening attitude, but it is plain from Lucrio's reply that he will not be seen again for the rest of that day. Then Palaestrio realizes that Philocomasium had been ahead of him in getting rid of Lucrio. This is not meant to belittle Palaestrio, but is in character with Philocomasium's coolness in Act II and with her shrewdness later in insisting that she shall carry off Palaestrio as a condition of her leaving, whereas Palaestrio had intended simply to run away after carrying the baggage down to the boat. It also squares with 1090, where Philocomasium is listening just inside Periplectomenus' door, having felt sure that both her guards were out of the way.

There is just one point on which I feel that I must break a lance with Fränkel. He argues that Sceledrus cannot be both the cellarer and the custodian of Philocomasium; he feels that Leo's conjecture that Sceledrus combined those functions involves a grave improbability. He argues therefore that this scene cannot really be meant to involve our Sceledrus, but was lifted from another play where a Sceledrus betrayed his office of cellarer and engaged in an amusing bacchanal. Probably Fränkel has forgotten that the slave staff of this house would not include a *custos*; there was no woman in the family for the *custos* to watch, and the soldier would hardly keep one on the off chance that now and then he would have a slightly unwilling mistress on the premises, for his affairs were generally with matrons. If a *custos* were needed, the cellarer would be a very likely slave to pick. Can it be that Fränkel absentmindedly conceives the wine-cellar to be in what we call a cellar or basement, which the ancient house did not have, so that the cellarer would be below stairs? It is much more likely that the locale of his office lay next to the spare bedroom, so that he could very easily exercise the function of guard. Furthermore, if we must go into this, the only time when he would be really busy would be when the

master was home and a guard was not needed. The cellarer, therefore, would be a logical choice for a temporary *custos*, and his underling would assume the same subordinate position in the temporary office. This whole scene, then, fits perfectly into the economy of the play, and I see no reason for believing that it was lifted from another play and inserted. The theory that Palaestrio was prudently preparing for the most likely mischances will therefore remove the last supports of Leo's theory of two models fitted together and of Fränkel's view that the Lucrio scene was taken from a third model.

RICHARD M. HAYWOOD.

THE HOTCHKISS SCHOOL.

#### A NOTE ON THE NICOMACHEAN ETHICS.

In the July issue of the *American Journal of Philology* (LXV, p. 248) Mr. C. Arthur Lynch proposes to emend Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* VI, 1142 b 19, by reading *ἴδιον* instead of the puzzling *ἰδαῖν* of the manuscripts. In this passage Aristotle points out that a man may plan successfully (and therefore rightly) for the attainment of an evil end. Mr. Lynch apparently finds this paradox expressed in the term *ἴδιον* as defined in *Topics* I, 102 a 18: *ἴδιον ὁ μὴ δημοῖ μὲν τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι, μόνῳ δ' ὑπάρχει καὶ ἀντικατηγορεῖται τοῦ πράγματος*. But to anyone familiar with the technical terminology of Aristotle's logic, Mr. Lynch's translation of *ἴδιον* in this passage by "personal (i. e. undefined, almost contradictory)" is impossible. Here it means "property," i. e. a predicate that does not exhibit the essence of a thing, but nevertheless belongs to that thing only and is predicated convertibly of it (see the chapter on the Predicables in any textbook of Aristotelian logic). This sense of the term has no particular relevance to the passage in the *Ethics*. If Mr. Lynch's conjectural reading is to stand, it will have to be on other grounds.

GLENN R. MORROW.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

## REVIEWS.

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XVIII. Edited with Translations and Notes by E. LOBEL, C. H. ROBERTS, and E. P. WEGENER. London, Egypt Exploration Society, 1941. Pp. xii + 215; frontispiece and 14 plates.<sup>1</sup>

This eighteenth volume of the multifarious records of Oxyrhynchus appears after a lapse of fourteen years for the series. The collaboration of Grenfell and Hunt had been brought to an end by the incapacitation of the former in 1920 and his death in 1926. One more volume, the seventeenth, was completed in 1927 under the editorship of Hunt. In 1934 death took Hunt also, and now this present wartime volume, the first whose title page lacks the name of A. S. Hunt, is presented as a memorial to that estimable scholar and bears a strikingly handsome portrait of him as its frontispiece. The Egypt Exploration Society is indeed fortunate to have secured the services of such able successors in a great tradition. The continuance of the series is promised in a nineteenth volume to contain "much more Alcaeus and Sappho" (p. vi).

Fifty new papyri are here published, and of these a goodly proportion are "New Classical Fragments." Mr. Lobel is responsible for the edition of all the new literary works, 2159-2176, and of the two fragments, 2178 and 2179, of Aeschylus, among the "Extant Classical Authors." For the remainder final responsibility was entrusted to Mr. Roberts. Miss Wegener prepared some of the "Documents of the Roman Period," 2182-2189, 2198, 2199, for publication. The first eleven excellent (as usual) indices (pp. 187-214) were prepared by Miss Barbara Flower, the last two (pp. 214-15) by Mr. H. I. Bell, who also acted as general editor.

While the format and method of publication remain essentially unaltered in this volume, Lobel was wisely allowed a certain latitude, one of his admirable innovations presumably (see p. xi) being the introduction of lunate sigma into the printing of this series, since this form (instead of the absurd and wasteful Byzantine double form) seems to be employed only on those pages (4-96; 101-2; 182-5, to be explicit) for which he was directly responsible. Unhappily, however, Lobel has made no attempt to offer continuous translations for his texts, even when they are fairly well preserved, for in such difficult material it would have been helpful at least to know what a scholar of such celebrated erudition and ingenuity thought the general sense might have been.

There are only two theological fragments: 2157 from the *Epistle to the Galatians*, and 2158 from a codex of Philo already known from other finds. These fragments of Philo contain enough distinct-

<sup>1</sup> The initials of each of the two reviewers are attached to those special observations which are peculiarly his own.

tive words to be identifiable if they were from any of Philo's extant works. The editor is certainly right in saying that they cannot be placed among these works.<sup>2</sup>

2159-2164 are all fragments of the dramas of Aeschylus. They, together with 2178 and 2179, portions of the *Agamemnon* and the *Seven against Thebes*, are all by the hand of the same scribe who wrote the *Niobe*, the *Glaucus Potnieus*, and the *Dictyulci* of *P. S. I.*, 1208-1210; but it seems odd that one has to turn to *P. S. I.* in order to learn the date of this piece from the second Christian century. Probably, then, in all these fragments we have the remnants of a complete edition of Aeschylus' dramas.—It looks like a precise reversal of fact to say that the text "agrees in all respects with M," since in no more than 81 letters all told (not every one of these entirely certain, either) there are two striking variations. For  $\eta$  fails to appear in line 16, while line 30 probably begins with the letter  $\pi$ , certainly not M's  $\epsilon\alpha$ ; and the presence of line 7 proves nothing at all, since it is found in all known MSS, being omitted only in a late quotation, and deleted first by Pauw. Discrepancies in the two columns between the records of what can still be read (as in 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, and 30) are a bit hard to understand, but make little difference, one may hope (W. A. O.).

2159 adds to the ten already known fragments of the *Γλαῦκος Πόντιος* and includes a coincidence with the two lines of Nauck's frag. 30, but unhappily does not, in its 15 complete lines, add anything essential to our understanding of the plot of that play.

2160 is composed of eight small scraps of the *Γλαῦκος Ποτνιεύς*, of which Nauck has only seven fragments. It belongs to *P. S. I.*, 1210, where the play was first identified.

2161 is to be added to the two fragments of *P. S. I.*, 1209 and removes all doubt about their belonging to Aeschylus' *Δικτυουλοί*. Of this satyr play there had been known previously only three fragments amounting to no more than five words in all. Here we have 68 lines of the text, some of which are complete. They are verses 765-832 of the play, as indicated by the number  $\theta$  in the margin against line 2, col. 2 (on this kind of thing, and the unusual system of notation employed for it, see no. 841, and especially the note on no. 852, frag. 25). The scene presented is that just subsequent to the rescue of Danae and Perseus from the sea. While agreeing with the editor that the case is already proved on other grounds, one might well prefer to regard the appearance of such words as *ποππυσμός*, *πάππας*, *ποσθοφιλής*, and *μικρός* as the very best kind of proof of the satyric character of the piece.—On line 771 Lobel remarks "*νηπίοις* is not excluded by the ink but seems to be so by the sense." Yet in a scene dealing with a baby what could be more appropriate than the phrase *νηπίοις προσφθέγμασιν*, "childish prattle," if the word be taken in its primary significance; or "silly

<sup>2</sup>Incidentally, at this point, the senior reviewer, as one not unacquainted with the *stulta diligentia* of index-makers, wishes courteously to protest against Lobel's quite casual manner in disposing of the massive and fabulously accurate labors displayed in Johannes Leise-gang's 878 page index to the works of Philo, by merely calling it "the index to Cohn and Wendland's edition."



talk," if taken in its secondary meaning? For after all this *is* a satyr play in which "silly talk" is quite as likely to be mentioned as "gentle words" (W. A. O.).—Again, Lobel appears to be quite too skeptical of his own extremely probable restoration of lines 783-4, since, although one grants that "you shared the greater blame" is "not a correct way to express 'the greater part of the blame was yours,'" still such slightly illogical forms of expression or jumbled ideas are common in all literature. Do not both Homer and Epictetus say "chopped off his neck" when they really mean "chopped off his head by severing his neck"? The innumerable examples of transferred epithet are surely no more logical than the literal sense produced by Lobel's supplements. And any poet who can write "folk-hurled stoning curses" (*Agam.* 1616) when he really means "people's curses and death by stoning at their hand" (Smyth) should scarcely boggle at an expression the sense of which is perfectly obvious, not only in itself but above all in the context (W. A. O.).

2162 gives us our first papyrus fragment of Aeschylus' *Θεωροὶ ἢ Ἰσθμιασταί* from which Nauck has only one literary fragment. Parts of four columns are preserved, two of them fairly complete, and these contain some sixty lines of text. This piece too is obviously, from the general tone and vocabulary (*πράγματα παρέχειν, μύονρος, γύννις*), a satyr play. Not much can be made of the banter between the chorus and apparently two actors. Just what the *παροιμία* alluded to in frag. 1(a), col. 1, 32 was I cannot see, but because of *Ἰσθμιαστικὴν* in line 30, *τὴν πάλαι παροιμίαν* in line 32, and *ισθμιάζεις* in line 34, it seems not unreasonable to suppose that some sort of reference is intended to the proverb *ισθμιάσαι· παροιμία ἐπὶ κακοῦ βίου. ἐπίνοσος γὰρ ὁ καιρὸς ἐν ᾧ τὰ Ἰσθμια ἄγεται* (Hesychius), or, as it appears in Suidas, s. v. *Ἰσθμια . . . καὶ παροιμία· Ἰσθμιάζειν, ἐπὶ τῶν κακῶς βιούντων. ἐπίνοσος γὰρ ὁ τῶν Ἰσθμίων καιρὸς* (identical with this form, except for the introductory word *ισθμιάζει*, is no. 56 in Collection S, as recorded by L. Cohn, *Zu den Paroemiographen* [Breslau 1887], p. 78). Just possibly, therefore, in line 30 one might propose *ἐξέτριβες Ἰσθμιαστικὴν [νόσο]ν*, in the sense of "wiped out," "overcame." Again, in line 33, one might read *τοῦρχημα μᾶλλον εἰκὸς ἦν σέ [γ' εὐτυχ]εῖν* (W. A. O.).

2163 is composed of eleven minute fragments, one of which certainly belongs to Aeschylus' *Myrmidons*, while the rest are ascribed to it on external evidence. Frag. 1 coincides partially with Nauck's frag. 131 and confirms the correctness of Blomfield's supplement of *σὸν προπίνεις* from the lemma in Harpocration.

2164 belongs to the *Ξάντριοι*, as is proved for frag. 1, at least, by a coincidence with one of Nauck's five fragments. The best preserved lines, 16-30, are from a speech of Hera and are preceded by a passage in which Hera, Semele, Cadmus, and Zeus are mentioned. There is no sign of any commentary in this edition of Aeschylus' dramas, save for an isolated gloss on *P. S. I.*, 1211, 7. The appearance of the words *ἐν τῷ ᾧ περὶ τῶν* at the end of frag. 1 is, then, unusual enough to attract attention, and might suggest that we have here the end of the play (L. W. D.), Hera conceivably appearing in an *ex machina* rôle (W. A. O.), although the known fact that she

uttered these words in the guise of a begging priestess renders such a guess rather dubious (L. W. D.).

2165, fragments of the stasiotic poems of Alcaeus, presents, as Lobel remarks, "two among the longest and most nearly consecutive pieces of this poet that have yet been recovered." In the first fragment Alcaeus appeals to a trinity (Zeus, Hera, and Dionysus) to rescue him from exile, and to visit punishment on Pittacus who had, like Alcaeus, sworn never to join forces with the tyrants but to oppose them to the bitter end. The second piece is a sort of *Epistula ex Ponto* in which the poet pictures the sad fate of his exile to a rustic life somewhere near a sanctuary of Hera in which the women of Lesbos gather annually for a beauty contest. The marginal note on col. 1, line 9 which Lobel reads hesitatingly as  $\zeta\epsilon\theta\eta\lambda\bar{\alpha}$  might, as he suggests, and as the facsimile seems to show, also be read  $\zeta\epsilon\theta\eta\kappa\bar{\alpha}$ . This could then be explained as a variant on  $\epsilon\theta\eta\kappa\alpha\nu$  and as equivalent to  $\delta\iota\epsilon\theta\eta\kappa\alpha\nu$ . While  $\zeta\alpha-$  is fairly common for  $dja$  in Aeolic, there are relatively few examples of such a combination with other vowels than  $\alpha$ . In col. 1, line 9  $\text{Ζόνυσσον}$  appears and I see nothing to prevent such a formation as  $\zeta\epsilon\theta\eta\kappa\alpha\nu$ . There is, curiously enough, no example of the combination  $\delta\iota\epsilon-$  in either Alcaeus or Sappho. The meaning, "to put each in its own place" would fit very well here. Whether there is any justification for accepting this reading or not is, of course, another matter, but it could well have excellent authority (L. W. D.).

2167-2173 are all new fragments of Callimachus. 2167 and 2168 are from the first book of the *Aetia*, 2169 from the third, and 2170 from the fourth. None of these is extensive, but there are important coincidences with five previously known fragments. 2171 is to be added to *P. Oxy.*, 1011 and *P. S. I.*, 1216. Fragments 2 and 3 of 2171 are at the end of an epode describing the dimensions of the base, throne, and statue of Zeus at Olympia, giving its cost, and naming Pheidias as its sculptor. There are 31 more or less complete lines of this poem, followed in frag. 3 by parts of thirteen lines in praise of the Hermes Perphereus of Aenus in Thrace. 2172, in choriambic pentameters, is the end of a poem of Callimachus entitled  $\text{Βράγχος}$ , telling of Apollo's arrival at Miletus. The supplement  $\Delta\epsilon\lambda\phi]ίνι$  in line 11 appears to require the rare but perhaps possible synizesis of  $-ι' \acute{\alpha}-$  in order to fit the metrical scheme proposed by Lobel (W. A. O.). Finally, 2173 is from an unidentified poem, and preserves the beginnings of eighteen lines, five of which coincide with four known fragments.

2174-2175 are from two different rolls containing *Iambics* of Hipponax. Neither one is from the same roll as *P. S. I.*, 1089, and, while far more extensive than that single fragment, they are unhappily not very illuminating. Fragments 5, 6, and 8 are from a poem relating in parody the return of Odysseus. A part of the title of the poem is preserved and there is mention of the Phaeacians. There seems to be no compelling reason to suppose, as Lobel suggests, that frag. 9 is also from this poem. In line 11 the supplement  $\acute{\alpha}]θ\epsilon\rhoίνην$  appears to be gratuitous, while without it there would be some reference to the summer time, with which the more specific  $\mu\eta\eta\nu\alpha$  of the next line would then be quite compatible. If some

month name is to be supplied before *μῆνα* here, *Κλαριῶνα* could scarcely be improved upon. It is known not only epigraphically, but is Ephesian, and Bischoff (*R.-E.*, XI, col. 548) places it in the summer, while it also seems to fit perfectly the traces of the letters as they appear in the facsimile (L. W. D.). None of the other fragments of 2174 preserves any intelligible context. Frag. 1 of 2175 has something to do with Lerna and so presumably with Heracles, but the omnipresent *Κίκων* appears again in line 18. In frag. 3 there is a coincidence with Diehl's frag. 19 (Knox, 7): ἡλειφον - ~. ἔστι δ' οἱ ἡνπερ Κροῖσος, where *Κροῖσος* is a surprising variant on *κρόκος* as quoted by Athenaeus, but less surprising now that we can be sure the words belong to Hipponax and not to Athenaeus, as Hecker and Knox had supposed (L. W. D.). All these fragments now give us sufficient evidence of the truth of Heliodorus' statement that Hipponax combined seasons and trimeters in the same poem.

2176 is of first-rate interest, being sixteen fragments of a commentary on Hipponax to which *P. Oxy.*, 1233 may now be joined. The lemmata preserve several additional fragments of Hipponax. Ten lines of the commentary are pretty fully restored in the Addenda pp. 184-5 by combining frag. 3 with 4, and 2 with 8.

2177 is a third century fragment of the then very popular *Acta Alexandrinorum* relating an incident which occurred perhaps in the time of Hadrian, as that of the *Acta Hermaisci* of *P. Oxy.*, 1242 certainly did. It differs externally from the *Acta Appiani* (*P. Oxy.*, 33 + *P. Yale*, Inv. 1536), its speeches being introduced only by the name of the speaker, without the addition of *εἶπεν*.

Among the Extant Classical Authors (2178-2181), Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Plato are represented. There seems to be nothing remarkable or of any great value here. It is perhaps worth noting that the meagre scraps of the *Agamemnon* and the *Seven against Thebes* are "the first pieces of extant plays to turn up in Egypt." The fragments of Sophocles (2180) cover some hundred lines of the text of the *Oedipus Rex*. The Plato fragments are all from the *Phaedo* and extend from 75 A to 117 C of that dialogue. Doubtless the unplaced fragments (51-84) could also be located if the results would repay the effort. Frag. 69, e. g., certainly belongs at 108 D: Σώκρ]ατες; π[ερί, etc., and then the next line would have to be read μ]έντοι τα[ῦτα instead of ]αντοι τα[ (L. W. D.).

2182-2192<sup>3</sup> are documents of the Roman Period, among which the private letters possess the most general interest. 2190 is a 1st century letter from a son, who is studying in Alexandria, to his father at Oxyrhynchus, telling among other things of the difficulty of finding good teachers, and acknowledging receipt of considerable quantities of food from home (e. g., 126 lbs. of salted meat). The boy is also obviously much relieved to find that his father was not deeply disturbed because he had smashed the family chariot in some accident at the circus. 2192 is a second century letter from a person of definitely scholarly interests, requesting a friend to have certain learned books copied and sent to him. One of the books mentioned is an otherwise unknown *Tragodoumena* of Hypsistrates. The friend

<sup>3</sup> The incomplete reference under 2187, 21 "Lactantius, *Mort. Pers.*" is presumably to 17, 1.

is referred to a certain bookseller, Demetrius, by a third friend, Harpocraton. Perhaps a reviewer may be allowed enough more rashness than an editor to suggest that it is not beyond the realm of the possible that this Harpocraton, here twice referred to as an authority on where books were to be found, should be the well-known and presumably contemporary lexicographer, Valerius Harpocraton, of the near-by Alexandria.

Aside from 2193 and 2194, two enigmatic Graeco-Latin letters of the fifth or sixth century, from a pious soul who quotes some kind of "Scripture" in Latin to support a request in Greek, the other important Byzantine documents are lengthy accounts: 2195 and 2196 of receipts and expenditures, and 2197 of bricks, all for the estates of the Apion family.

The index of the new literary texts shows twenty-two words or forms not to be found in Liddell-Scott-Jones: ἀγροῖωτικός, Αἰόληος, ἀλλαλόκακος, ἀντίαος (= ἀντίαιος, ἀνταῖος?), αὐχενοπλήξ, ἐπιπασσαλεύειν, εὐδαίλος, θραυστολογία, καιρωτός, καλλιγράφτος, κειμήλιον ("inexplicable" says Lobel, but perhaps it stands for the rare adjective κειμήλιος [W. A. O.]), κιμαῖωι, κωλύτωρ, λάβολον, Λυδιεργής, πελατεύειν, προπράκτωρ, ῥηματίζειν, στατίν, ταραξίπους, Ὑρραος, χρυσολάμπετος. To these might well be added the practically certain ἐφεδρίς (cf. p. 184), κληγής, and ποσθοφίλης.

A few other lexicographical notes might also be recorded (W. A. O.): βανκάλιον, elsewhere only as a "gurgling jug," but here (2197, and perhaps also 2055, 42) a "measure of 3000 bricks." βιβλιοπώλης (2192) for the first time in papyri. βραδυνπλοία (2191) "slow passage," unattested hitherto. *commortalis* (2193 and 2194, recovered by conjecture from *commortis*) known to the *Thesaurus L. L.* only from Columella and Paulus Nolinus. ἔγκανμα (2206), pretty certainly a kind of "baked brick or tile," a meaning hitherto unknown. ἕξις (2191), for the first time in papyri, and therefore no colloquial term. In regard to the slightly surprising note on 2195, line 131 ἐπικειμ(ένω): presumably "overseer" one might observe that ὁ ἐπικείμενος as a general term for manager or overseer is so amply attested in Preisigke that it appears even in Liddell-Scott-Jones. κινύρη (2161) supports the MS-tradition of Aeschylus, *Sept.* 123, where some have printed μινύρονται from Hesychius. λεπίδιον (2195) "plating" on a ship, a new but practically certain meaning. It might have been better to call νυκτηγρεσία "a Greek name of the tenth book of the Iliad" rather than "the Greek name," etc., for this form was hitherto known only from Festus and several citations by Nonius of the *Nyctegresia* of Accius, on which point correct L.-S.-J., s. v. The same dictionary would have been better advised to cite νυκτηγρεσία (the far commoner form; see Stephanus) independently, and not simply (and without cross reference) as a byform of νυκτηγρεσία. ὀκνόλακκος (2197, 66 ff.) might mean "an artificial pool with a low brick wall round it." πορθμάριος (2195) "ferryman" (unknown to the lexicons) appears elsewhere only in *P. Merton*, 42, 4, as Roberts has noted. πρόσοψις (2197, 4) for the "facing" of a building appears in a hitherto unknown meaning.

A reviewer's verdict on the entire volume can only be that it is a masterly piece of work, constituting a worthy tribute to the man

it is intended to honor. The highest praise can best be expressed in the wish that these same editors may be permitted by the fortunes of war to bring the nineteenth volume speedily to publication.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.  
THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA.

W. A. OLDFATHER.  
LLOYD W. DALY.

HELMUT VENZKE. Die orphischen Argonautika in ihrem Verhältnis zu Apollonios Rhodios. Berlin, Junker und Dünhaupt Verlag, 1941. Pp. 112. (*Neue Deutsche Forschungen*, Band 292; Abteilung Klassische Philologie, Band 13.)

Three epic poems telling the tale of the Argonaut expedition have come down to us from antiquity. Apollonius of Rhodes composed his four books of *Argonautica* in the third century B.C.; under Vespasian, Valerius Flaccus expanded the story so as to fill twice as many books of Latin hexameters with a still incomplete rendering of the legend; and lastly, an unknown Greek writer condensed the whole story into a single book of 1400 lines, presumably in the fourth century of our era. His epic is called the *Orphic Argonautica* because it is foisted upon Orpheus, who was one of the Argonauts; the events are thus supposedly narrated by a man who took a prominent part in them.<sup>1</sup> The two later poets drew largely on the

<sup>1</sup> The author introduces his *Argonautica* to "Musaeus" and to the public at large in a preface so poorly worded that the point of his discussion has remained obscure. What precisely does "Orpheus" mean to say about the relation between his present book and his previous writings? For this puzzle I shall here propose a tentative solution.

In lines 11-46, "Orpheus" reviews all his religious writings, and within the framework of this catalogue he also mentions the journeys he had undertaken in the pursuit of his prophetic activities (40-5). The list is preceded by the remark (9-10) that he composed those works under the frightful goad of Bacchus and Apollo, that is, under the obsession of divine inspiration (cf. K. Ziegler, *R.-E.*, XVIII, 1, col. 1265). After the catalogue he goes on to say (47-8) that by now he has been freed from the maddening sting and that the "gadfly" which drove him has returned to heaven; and later (103-5) he elaborates this statement by explaining that his mother delivered him from roaming the world and from the gadfly, and sent him home to spend the rest of his days in tranquillity. Since his mother was the Muse, that is, the agent of divine inspiration (cf. also the use of the phrase "my mother" in 252), this will mean that, once he had perfected his religious writings, he was released from the heaven-sent trance that forced him to write and travel as he had done, and he was then permitted to live a normal life in Thrace. Subsequently, however, Jason came to Orpheus and persuaded him to take part in the Argonaut expedition (70-109) which is described in the present poem. Now, so he declares, he has decided to write this book, "things I have never said while I was driven by the goad of Bacchus and Apollo" (7-10). If we take to the letter the assertion: "I am composing a book which (*τάπερ*) I have never written before," it makes no sense; the author must rather mean: "a book such as (*οἷα*) I never wrote in my prophetic days." He returns to the subject again in 47-9 where he says: "Now that the gadfly has left



work of Apollonius, and the manner in which they used their model makes an interesting subject for investigation. With respect to Valerius, the matter has been studied by Friedrich Mehmel in a brilliant dissertation (*Valerius Flaccus* [Hamburg, 1934]). Comparing Valerius not only with Apollonius but with other epic poets as well, Mehmel brings out in vivid colors the specific manner and artistic aims of each writer. The book under review, which has likewise served as thesis for the doctorate, undertakes a similar task for the Orphic poet. Its preface declares that, since other scholars who worked on the subject (G. Dottin, J. R. Bacon, K. Hoffmann, J. Rosenboom) have not conducted a methodical and complete investigation, there is an urgent need for determining the relationship between pseudo-Orpheus and Apollonius. Helmut Venzke was killed in the present war, and his dissertation was posthumously published by Ludwig Deubner. In the opinion of this reviewer, however, the manuscript was not ripe for publication.

Venzke's task was not easy. By accident or a kind of contagion, all three *Argonautica* are couched in a cramped, unnatural language, so that it is often hard to make out what the writer is trying to convey. In the matter of style, the *Orphic Argonautica* is the worst. Pseudo-Orpheus attempts to write in the antique epic language, but his knowledge of it is woefully defective. By way of vocabulary, for instance, he uses *πίσυνος* "trusting in" when he means "obedient to,"<sup>2</sup> and he gives the Homeric verb *ἀλυσκάζω* "to escape" the meaning of the Hellenistic *ἀλύω* "to loiter."<sup>3</sup> In addition to the

my person and gone to heaven, you will hear such things as (*δσσα*, in the sense of *ολα*) I have hidden previously." The writer seems to lay considerable stress on the fact that after the conclusion of his prophetic career Orpheus is for the first time composing a book with different, that is, secular, content.

It is not an unwarranted assumption that in the lingo of this writer *τάπερ* or *δσσα* can stand for the classical *ολα*. He uses *ολσι* in 391 where he ought to have written *ολοις*; and the corresponding forms of *ολος* would have been more appropriate than *α* in 831, or *δσον* in 43, *δσσα* in 425, *δσσον* in 477, and *δσσα* in 905. The word *ολος*, frequent though it was in the texts he tried to imitate, is used by him only once (859). The colloquial Greek of his time had probably already dropped the word.

No other authority mentions Orpheus' delivery by his mother from inspired madness, and it is quite possible that our poet originated the tale. If the interpretation we have suggested is correct, it throws light both on this innovation and on the purpose of the entire preface. The author of the *Orphic Argonautica* anticipated that his forgery would be repudiated because a worldly poem would not fit into the picture which people had of Orpheus. To obviate this, he made up a story according to which Orpheus continued to write, although in a different vein, after his career as an author of prophetic verse had come to an end.

<sup>2</sup> Lines 265 and 707. In 42, however, the word is used correctly. All three lines are very similar.

<sup>3</sup> I think it is this, "loitering," that pseudo-Orpheus means in line 437 with *ἀλυσκάζοντες* (*ἐμυμον*). His use of the word *ἀλυσκάζω* is perhaps caused by a reminiscence of Apollonius, IV, 57; both lines mention a cave.

epic phraseology, there seem to be some reminiscences from tragic diction; thus in 358 *χείρας ἐρετμώσαντες* is a muddled reminiscence from Euripides, *Medea*, 4. Frequently, however, the writer lapses back into the colloquial Greek of his own times; thus again and again he has the late verb *ἀπλώω* "to stretch out," and he loosely uses the verb *περῶ*, just as the modern *περνῶ*, for the idea of passing from one place to another.<sup>4</sup> His grammar, or the lack of it, is atrocious; he seems to believe that, the stranger the way he puts his words together, the more they will sound genuinely archaic.<sup>5</sup> He may have felt, moreover, that a divine seer like Orpheus ought to talk differently from ordinary mortals even when telling a tale of adventures. In any case, his style takes almost unbelievable liberties.<sup>6</sup> By way of content, we find such oddities as Orpheus "silently issuing from his lips a deep-droning, soundless voice" to conjure up Sleep who "hears" him and, obeying the call, closes the eyes of the dragon that guards the Golden Fleece.<sup>7</sup> Despite all this, however,

<sup>4</sup> As in 141 and 163, *ἐπέρησεν* "arrived"; in 442 (cf. also 356 and 652), *εἰσεπέρησε* "entered" (*scil.* the cave); and in the following line, *περᾶν* "to leave" (*scil.* the cave).

<sup>5</sup> His use of cases, prepositions, and pronouns is hair-raising. He is much better in the matter of tenses; but he has, for instance, three mistaken future tenses (two of them are rectified in part of the manuscript tradition) in this sentence (284): *ἡγεμόνα στήσασθε καὶ ᾧ περὶ πάντα μελήσει, σημανέειν (!) ὃ τι κεν ῥέξαι* (the verb is wrong but the tense is here correct) *ἔπος ἡδὲ καὶ ἔργον πόντον ἐπιπλώσουσιν (!) ἀφιζόμενοι (!) ῥ' ἐπὶ γαίαν*. In fact, his diction is so consistently queer that one might think Greek was not his native tongue. Georges Dottin (*Les Argonautiques d'Orphée* [Paris 1930], pp. cii-cxxxvii) lists some of this writer's peculiarities, but his observations fall necessarily far short of the facts, for the diction of the Orphic poet is confused and confusing beyond description. Take, for instance, two lines from the catalogue of the Argonauts, referring to Canthus:

142: *δν δὴ μοῖρ' ἐδάμασσε, τέλος δ' ἐπέθηκεν ἀνάγκη  
φθίσθαι ὑπὲρ Διβύης, νόστον δ' οἴκοιο λαθέσθαι.*

This couplet imitates what Apollonius had written in I, 78-81:

*Οὐ μὲν ἐμελλεν  
νοστήσειν Κήρινθον ὑπότροπος, αἶσα γὰρ ἦεν  
αὐτὸν ὁμῶς Μόψον τε δαήμονα μαντοσυνάων  
πλαγχθέντας Διβύης ἐνὶ πείρασι δηωθῆναι.*

A comparison of the two texts shows that *δν μοῖρ' ἐδάμασσε* is supposed to mean "Destiny had condemned him to die," *scil.* on the expedition which is now beginning, but actually the Homeric locution (cf. *Il.*, XVIII, 119; *Od.*, XXII, 413) means "he died," that is, then and there. And again, the words *τέλος ἐπέθηκεν ἀνάγκη* try to convey the idea that Canthus was doomed, but they sound as if his life came now to an end. The phrase of Apollonius, *Διβύης ἐνὶ πείρασι* is turned into *ὑπὲρ (!) Διβύης*. The galimatias *νόστον οἴκοιο λαθέσθαι* defies rational analysis; Homer (*Od.*, IX, 97) has the phrase *νόστου λαθέσθαι*, and *οἴκοιο* seems to stand for *οἰκόνδε*.

<sup>6</sup> Possibly his metre is likewise licentious, but whenever a verse is faulty we have no means of knowing whether the tradition or the author is responsible for it. A text in which any anomaly may have to be tolerated cannot be properly edited.

<sup>7</sup> Lines 1002 ff. The parallel might have been mentioned in Venzke's footnote on *σιγα ἐκέκλετο*, 702 (note 145 on p. 87).

the poem is not wholly bad. The wording has sometimes an arresting turn. The author says, for instance, with a bold but engaging phrase that Medea, in her infatuation for Jason, threw away γάμων εὐήνορα θυμόν ("the thought of marrying a good man").<sup>8</sup> There are picturesque traits in the narrative, like that of the musical Centaur who, amazed that all living nature around his cave was spellbound by the song of Orpheus, "again and again waved his hand from the wrist and pawed the ground with his hoofs" (440-1).<sup>9</sup>

One would think that, first of all, the particular style and manner of pseudo-Orpheus ought to be studied anew in order to establish a firm basis on which to build up a comparison with Apollonius. The peculiar character of the Orphic writer is probably most apparent in the last section (802-1376) where the poet completely detaches himself from Apollonius. But Venzke all but ignores the last section of the *Orphic Argonautica* which covers nearly two fifths of the whole, and concentrates on that part where pseudo-Orpheus follows Apollonius. And not even here does Venzke display any interest in the individuality of his author or, for that matter, in the individuality of Apollonius. He seems only to be aware that one writer imitates, but not quite duplicates, the work of some other writer. The categories under which he deals with literature are limited in the extreme, and the lack of any broader views makes his book dry and colorless. This is in sharp contrast to Mehmél's inspiring essay on a closely related subject,<sup>10</sup> an essay which seems to have escaped Venzke's notice.

The bulk of Venzke's dissertation (pp. 24-108) consists of a comparison, passage by passage, between pseudo-Orpheus and Apollonius. Agreements and discrepancies are listed with respect to the expressions used;<sup>11</sup> to the facts of the story; to the order in which the events are narrated; and to expansion, contraction, omission or alteration of details. Where pseudo-Orpheus gives a different version of the legend, other possible sources are noted.<sup>12</sup> It was advisable, of course, to carry through such a comparison between the two texts, but there was no need to reproduce it in full.<sup>13</sup> A

<sup>8</sup> Line 885. Θυμός is the wrong word for "thought," but the use of εὐήνορα at the side of γάμων conforms with the best tradition of elevated tragic style. Dottin (see note 5 *supra*) has missed the meaning of εὐήνορα.

<sup>9</sup> Liddell and Scott quote two examples from Lucian which show that ἐπισείειν τὴν χεῖρα was a gesture of approval and applause. Thus Venzke is wrong when he says that the Centaur beat the time with his hand (p. 61).

<sup>10</sup> Compare, for instance, the treatment of the Cyzicus episode by Venzke (pp. 68-9) with that by Mehmél (*Valerius Flaccus*, pp. 32-3).

<sup>11</sup> Pseudo-Orpheus evidently had his head crammed with phrases which he had read somewhere in Apollonius' *Argonautica*, and verbal reminiscences from his model would offer themselves freely to his pen as he was setting down line after line of his own poem.

<sup>12</sup> Venzke deserves credit for calling attention to certain coincidences with Valerius Flaccus; for a list of these see the index on p. 112.

<sup>13</sup> And yet the treatment is not complete. Lines 355-75 are disregarded, although they contain at least one imitation (365 resembles Apollonius, I, 542). Another defect is that imitations from Homer,

few examples would have been sufficient to illustrate the well-known and obvious fact that pseudo-Orpheus follows his model sometimes very closely and at other times less accurately.<sup>14</sup> As it is, many of Venzke's observations are pointless or repetitious, and the general results are meager.<sup>15</sup> Naturally, the discussion of such sections where pseudo-Orpheus is more or less at variance with his model proves more substantial than the treatment of passages where the later writer merely repeats his predecessor's story. Readings of the Orphic text are often discussed but Venzke shows himself inexperienced in matters of textual criticism. Much space is given to the geographical errors of which the Orphic poet is guilty. Whenever he is at fault while his model offered more correct information, we are at a loss rationally to explain the change for the worse. Venzke seems to be right when he insists that pseudo-Orpheus is cavalier in his geography to the point of constructing a "Phantasialegend" (p. 100).

On p. 45 Venzke defends an improbable reading of the Orphic text, and rejects a plausible emendation,<sup>16</sup> with the assumption that the author "sich absichtlich unklar ausgedrückt hat, um die Benutzung von Apollonios zu verschleiern."<sup>17</sup> On p. 103, on the other hand, we find the opposite contention: "Es ist, als wollte O (= pseudo-Orpheus) am Schluss dieser von Apollonios so stark abweichenden Partie mit Absicht noch einmal deutlich an seine Vorlage anklingen."<sup>18</sup> The book is concluded with a short "Sum-

after one general reference to them (p. 25), are entirely lost sight of. Thus we are not reminded, on p. 56, that one of the lines quoted (446) is borrowed from Homer (*Od.*, XVI, 15).

<sup>14</sup> The examples could be so selected that the typical features were all represented, and for each feature parallels from other passages could have been added.

<sup>15</sup> That Orpheus is given a more prominent rôle than he had in Apollonius is neither a new nor a startling discovery. One of the more positive results is that pseudo-Orpheus often changes the time of the day for an incident to happen. For Venzke's idea of the general character of the imitation see *infra*. On pp. 9-11, Venzke has some good observations on the use by pseudo-Orpheus of the first person plural.

<sup>16</sup> In 189 an Argonaut is said to have been born to Antianira ἀμβρόσιον παρὰ χεῦμα, but the name of the river is required. Heringa emended ἀμβρόσιον to Ἀμφρύσιον, because Apollonius says in I, 54 that another Argonaut was born ἐπ' Ἀμφρύσσῳ ῥοῇσιν and mentions two lines later Antianira as the mother of two Argonauts. The scholium b on Apollonius, I, 54-55 says that Amphrysus was also called Ἀμβρυσσος, which form is still closer to ἀμβρόσιον.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. also, on p. 99, "absichtlich unklar," and, on p. 110 (see below), "Verdunkelung der Darstellung des Apollonios." Georges Dottin (*op. cit.*, p. lv) had said exactly the same: "Sur beaucoup de points Orphée n'a fait que reprendre le texte d'Apollonios en l'obscurcissant . . ." "Tout se passe comme si Orphée avait utilisé le poème d'Apollonios avec la préoccupation de ne pas être taxé de plagiat."

<sup>18</sup> Both assumptions are combined on p. 13: "(Pseudo-Orpheus) komponiert häufig bis in kleine Einzelheiten parallel seinem Vorbild, wie um auf die Ähnlichkeit aufmerksam zu machen, bringt dann aber doch wieder andere Nuancen hinein, wie um zu zeigen: es ist doch nicht dasselbe."

mary" (pp. 109-11) which surprises the reader with a new theory. Venzke suggests here (p. 110), without further elaboration, that pseudo-Orpheus "seinem Werke durch die Umarbeitung der allseits bekannten Argonautika des Apollonios den Stempel der Echtheit und Altertümlichkeit geben wollte. Das, was in Wirklichkeit eine Verdunkelung der Darstellung des Apollonios ist, sollte man für die Ursache und ältere Darstellung halten, die der Alexandriner benutzt und deren unklare geographische Vorstellungen er auf Grund der inzwischen erworbenen Kenntnisse korrigiert haben sollte." This contention contradicts itself; the term "inchoate legend" (Ursage) conflicts with the notion of the poem's authenticity (Echtheit) as the work of one of the voyagers. The Argonaut who put into verse the original log book, so to speak, of the Argo ought to have known better than anyone else whether the eastbound vessel had first sailed past the mouth of the Halys (lines 736-37) and subsequently past the "elbow of Sinope" (line 754) or rather in the reverse order (see Venzke, pp. 94-6). When pseudo-Orpheus mixes up the correct geographical statements of his source (cf. Apollonius, II, 946 and 963), this is probably due to mere carelessness and indifference, and we do not have to look for an ulterior motive.

Venzke's book, then, which is neither solid nor sparkling, makes little progress towards answering the question it poses. But it still remains to be seen whether a more adequate approach will reach any spectacular new results. If pseudo-Orpheus were a normal writer, the nature of his imitation could be properly determined, with some significant features showing up in salient relief. But his diction and his entire artistic character are irrational and capricious. Perhaps this is one good reason why today, 140 years after his indebtedness to Apollonius was established, the way in which he handled his source material has not yet been described in a satisfactory fashion.<sup>19</sup>

HERMANN FRÄNKEL.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

M. L. W. LAISTNER and H. H. KING. *A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts*. Ithaca, Cornell Univ. Press, 1943. Pp. x + 168. \$3.00.

One of the pressing desiderata in the general field of patristic scholarship for many years has been the determination of what is genuine and what is spurious in the writings of the more significant among the Latin fathers of the early Middle Ages. Among these the Venerable Bede has quite properly received more attention than any other pre-Carolingian father save Augustine of Hippo. The universality of his genius, the breadth of his learning, his modern and critical spirit, and the steady persistence of his influence through the centuries fully justify Manitius' judgment of him as "der bedeutendste Gelehrte des früheren Mittelalters." But his very renown has made no little trouble for modern scholars. Great numbers of works, probably mounting into the hundreds, have been ascribed to him, either by careless and indiscriminating copyists or by poetasters

<sup>19</sup> The recent article on the *Orphic Argonautica* by Keydell, *R.-E.*, XVIII, 2, cols. 1333 ff., was not available to me.



or theologasters who wanted their works to have a dissemination their worth would not of itself ensure. Thus the modern scholar, trying to build a picture of the true Bede, is incredibly confused and hampered by the mass of material assigned to him in manuscripts and in all the editions from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century. It is enough to discourage even the most hardy soul.

Professor Laistner has been, for many years now, the leading student of Bede, and we are indebted to his researches for many notable contributions to our knowledge of the venerable Northumbrian's life and works. Following upon his recent edition of the *Expositio Actuum Apostolorum et Retractatio* (1939), a masterly example of what a critical edition should be, he has now, with the assistance of Dr. King of the Cornell Library staff, laid all students of patristic theology and learning further under his debt by this most useful *Hand-List*. Henceforth we have a clear picture of the transmission of the indubitably authentic works of Bede. The elimination of *dubia* and *spuria* was made the more necessary by the fact that the most recent publication of the *opera omnia* of Bede, in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, was bad on a monumental scale, and included more *spuria* than any previous edition. Laistner has quite simply and effectively gone to the root of the problem and taken as a criterion for authenticity Bede's own list of his works, in Book V, chap. 24 of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*. He finds it necessary to go outside of this list in only a very few cases of works which Bede may not yet have written by the time he compiled his list, 731, or may have neglected to mention for some reason or other.

In his Introduction Laistner studies the spread of manuscript copies of the various works, both as to date and place of writing. By far the greatest number of copies of works of Bede in any single century were written in the twelfth century, but there was a surprising revival of interest in Bede in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Laistner admits puzzlement at this renewal of interest in Bede, both as a biblical commentator and as a historian, and I must admit a similar inability to explain it. To put this fact into its proper perspective, however, a comparative study of manuscript tradition for Augustine, Jerome, Gregory, Isidore, Alcuin, Anselm, Bernard of Clairvaux, and Peter the Lombard would have to be undertaken. A composite tabulation of datable manuscript copies of works of these authors might yield interesting results. As to place of writing, it is not surprising that so many are of English provenance, but rather that so many are definitely Continental.

The authors are modest in their claims for completeness, pointing out that they have consulted only the printed catalogues of manuscript collections to be found in the Cornell library, but on the evidence of this book one is moved to the comment that it must be a delight to work with the Cornell collection of manuscript catalogues. Manuscripts from over 230 collections are cited.

It is difficult to add anything to the list so carefully compiled, but a few details are offered. Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek MS 67, saec. XII, is the copy referred to by Laistner, p. 39, without signature, containing the comment on Esdras and Nehemiah; MS 78 of the same collection, saec. XII, contains, ff. 1<sup>a</sup>-129<sup>b</sup>, the comment on the Catholic Epistles; MS 147, saec. XII, contains, ff. 2<sup>b</sup>-72<sup>a</sup>, the

text of the *Martyrologium* ascribed to Bede in Migne, though how pure the text may be is not indicated in Fischer's catalogue; MS 231, saec. XII, contains the *De locis sanctis*. The *De templo Salomonis* is found in Leipzig, Stadtbibliothek 166, saec. XII, ff. 129<sup>b</sup>-167<sup>a</sup>. The indication of "MS 27" of the Domkapitel Library of Prague (p. 101) does not correspond to the present signature. MS G 27, no. 1020 in Podlaha's catalogue, which contains this work of Bede, is at present in the library of the Strahov Monastery in Prague. The *De tabernaculo* is found in the Prague Chapter Library (Domkapitel or Knihovna metropolitní kapitoly) MS 248 (A 143), saec. XIII, ff. 1<sup>a</sup>-133<sup>a</sup>, and in the Prague National Museum, MS 3676 (XVI C 13), saec. XIV, ff. 170<sup>a</sup>-236<sup>b</sup>. Only manuscripts containing all or substantial parts of the 50 genuine *Homiliae* are listed by Laistner. Copies of single homilies, even if genuine, are not listed. In view of the appalling number of *homiliaria* current in the Middle Ages, which were made up of homilies lifted from various church fathers, the decision to simplify the listing can only be praised. Furthermore, most of the homilies generally listed as Bede's in these *homiliaria* may be assumed to be spurious. But an occasional exception may be noted. In the National Museum in Prague, MS 3344 (XIII E 10), saec. XIV, contains, ff. 33<sup>b</sup>-140<sup>b</sup>, a collection of homilies ascribed to Bede, some of which are certainly genuine, though how many I cannot now say. The same is true of MS 3293 (XIII B 7), saec. XIV, of the same collection. The first homily in this collection is No. IV of the second group of 25 homilies. But, as Laistner remarks, the tedious disentanglement of the genuine from the spurious in these and numerous other late copies would yield little textual profit.

As to the various Cheltenham and Middlehill manuscripts (e. g. Laistner, pp. 32, 51, 91, 103), it is not certain that they still form part of the collection now at Cheltenham. Phillipps manuscripts have a disconcerting way of not being available at Cheltenham and then reappearing in some bookseller's catalogue or in some library. It is more usual, I believe, to refer to the "Script. eccles. lat." (pp. 22, 152, 159, etc.) under "Canonici," of which larger collection they form a part. Several collections which do not appear in Laistner's list might, when the opportunity offers, be profitably consulted, e. g. Biblioteca nazionale at Florence, San Marco at Venice, San Antonio at Padua, Biblioteca universitaria at Pavia, Biblioteca Malatestiana at Cesena, the Cabildo at Toledo (though I am not sure how much of this library was destroyed in the civil war), the Colombina at Seville, the Stadtbibliothek at Nürnberg, the Hospital at Kues. Other uncatalogued collections may be expected eventually to yield some valuable copies of works of Bede, though the chances of finding any early manuscripts hitherto unnoticed are slight. It may be hoped, furthermore, that some of the "untraced" manuscripts may turn up in the hitherto uncatalogued "Additional" manuscripts at the British Museum, Cambridge University Library, or the Bodleian at Oxford. At all events this hand-list makes the work of other workers in the field relatively simple. We could wish for parallel works for the other *patres et doctores ecclesiae* as expertly conceived and executed.

S. HARRISON THOMSON.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO.

CHARLES EDWARD SMITH. *Tiberius and the Roman Empire*. Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1942. Pp. vi + 281. \$2.75.

This book marks a retreat from the advanced positions of modern historical scholarship. If it were only topheavy with Tacitus, that would be understandable, for Tacitus, since he was well informed and honest, is and always will be indispensable. But to adopt for his own pattern, as Professor Smith has done, that amazing compound of selection, organization, and interpretation of the historical material which Tacitus believed to be the true history of Imperial Rome, is something else again. Modern historians are with slight exception unanimous in recognizing that Tacitus has done less than justice to Tiberius, and that his underlying conception of the Principate is at variance with public opinion in the provinces and the judgment of the middle class in Italy.

The extent of the author's reliance upon Tacitus may be seen from the number of footnotes which monotonously begin by acknowledging the *Annals*: 42 out of 45 in Chap. II; 59 out of 64 in Chap. III; 50 out of 68 in Chap. VIII; 80 out of the first 91 in Chap. IX; 64 out of 88 in Chap. X. All of this means that *Tiberius and the Roman Empire* tells us what Tacitus thought of Tiberius, but it does not tell us what modern historical investigation has discovered about him,—or about Tacitus himself.

To put the case in another form, let us look at one or two typical chapters. Chap. III, "The German Campaigns," follows Tacitus' account day by day and step by step with all the confusion and vagueness that characterize that account. Chap. IX, "War and Peace in the Provinces," deals with those tangential events and those particular turns and twists of politics or administration that caught Tacitus' eye. Little Tacfarinas is assigned nine pages abounding in such descriptions as "The legion was posted in the center of the Roman line and was flanked by the auxiliary infantry and cavalry" (p. 181). Or "[The enemy's] cavalry were unable to form, since most of the horses still were tethered in distant pasturages; the infantry likewise were disordered as the Roman attack developed" (p. 189). There was of course an intimate connection between the revolt and the cadastre ordered by Tiberius after its suppression, but the author of *Tiberius and the Roman Empire* does not seem to be aware of such prosaic things as land surveys. He does not bother even with the causes of the revolt. The handling of the problem of Thrace, Parthia, and Cappadocia is inadequate and superficial. Then follow two pages on relief of public distress and on rights of asylum, but not one word on the activities of Roman bankers, merchants, and colonists, on the opportunities for employment in the Imperial military and civil services opened up to the natives, or the splendid achievements in urbanization, or the expansion of Roman culture, or the creation of a prosperous provincial economy. Three short paragraphs on building activity, gathered from documents (the secondary sources from which they seem to be mostly derived should have been acknowledged in all cases), and tacked on at the end of the chapter, emphasize by contrast Tacitus' monopoly on the author's sense of historical values. This is all about

the provinces. And yet it was six or seven decades ago that Mommsen wrote that the history of the Imperial period "is to be sought and to be found" in the towns and plantations of Africa, the homes of the wine-dressers on the Moselle, etc. In keeping with the antiquated character of this study, the hoary work of W. T. Arnold, *The Roman System of Provincial Administration*, is referred to, but G. H. Stevenson, *Roman Provincial Administration till the Age of the Antonines* (Oxford, 1939), ignored.

*Tiberius and the Roman Empire*, then, marks no progress in the modern historiography of Imperial Rome. Thirteen years ago Marsh published *The Reign of Tiberius*, a work fundamentally defective in that it was based on the literary sources alone, chiefly Tacitus. And now comes a study four-fifths of which (or eight chapters out of eleven and nearly 180 pages out of 256) is Tacitus re-edited. As if we did not already have the two excellent translations by Ramsay and Jackson, and as if modern scholarship were not three centuries ahead of Le Nain de Tillemont and one in advance of Merivale.

Instead of carving a new design from the wealth of material recently brought out by British and European scholars, *Tiberius and the Roman Empire* repeats this cobwebbed, stereotyped scheme: "The Mutiny of A. D. 14" (Chap. II); "The German Campaigns" (Chap. III); "Germanicus in the East" (Chap. IV); "The Trial of Piso" (Chap. V); "Sejanus" (Chap. VI); "The Retirement to Capri and the Fall of Sejanus" (Chap. VII); "Lèse Majesté Prosecutions under Tiberius" (Chap. VIII); "War and Peace in the Provinces" (Chap. IX). Is it too much to hope that whoever in the future writes the next book on Tiberius will reduce this drivel into one short chapter? Surely we have had enough of this picayune narration of factional, family, and personal intrigue that passes for Roman History. We are impatiently waiting for something more significant, something more nearly representative of the undying record the Empire of Tiberius wrote on the face of three continents.

We are not content to know which aristocrat was general and why; we want to know something about the racial and social origin of the common soldier and sailor, and about their influence on the frontier or the coast where they served and the country where they settled as veterans. We are not unmindful of the importance of the identity or career of a governor, but we are interested also in the identity and career of the imperial procurators and other civil servants who had so vital a rôle in the economic life of the provinces. They and the people from every walk of life among whom they worked—they more than the office-holding or office-seeking nobility in whose careers Tacitus and Smith are interested—made up the Roman Empire. And the policies of Tiberius affected them at every turn. The record of their aspirations and accomplishments and the story of the imperial policy are written in the monuments, inscriptions, papyri, coins, books, and laws that have survived, and in the life of the spirit, the cults, the *mores* and institutions which happily can be traced by the trained historian. But one must sweat and toil to bring this record out. It is easier to follow Tacitus.

In matters of detail Smith can depart from Tacitus. Several instances could be cited, and usually they rest on good judgment.



His conclusions, however, would inspire more confidence if they had been arrived at, not by rule of thumb, but by checking one fact against another, or one writer against another writer, or a literary against a documentary source, or at any rate by revealing the processes of his reasoning or the ultimate basis of each judgment. But, even at its best, the piecemeal approach is inadequate; the only valid method is to analyze and evaluate from its roots up the basic conception Tacitus had of both Tiberius and the Principate. The absence of this indispensable treatment is underlined among other things by the silence about Jerome's initial study on this subject, "The Tacitean Tiberius. A Study in Historiographical Method," *Class. Phil.*, VII (1912), pp. 265-92. Velleius Paterculus is of course cited, but the problem of the well-known antithesis between him and Tacitus is nowhere hinted at. Nor is there any inkling of the existence of the studies of Burmeister, Faust, Goeke, Münzer, and Raff on Velleius, not even of W. Schäfer's *Tiberius und seine Zeit im Lichte der Tradition des Velleius Paterculus* (Halle, 1912), or of J. Schwab's *Leben und Charakter des Tiberius Claudius Nero nach Velleius und Tacitus bis zum Jahre 29 n. Chr.* (Progr. Teschen a. E. Staats-Ober-Realgymn., 1912).

Chap. X, on the Senate and the Administration of Italy, is the most satisfactory. It might have been strengthened if it had included certain materials dissipated elsewhere, e.g., the evidence that Tiberius desired to place more responsibility in the hands of the Fathers (p. 185). But the sample or anecdotal treatment, good as far as it goes, is inconclusive and pointless unless it be underpinned by an evaluation of the factors that gave shape and being to each separate measure, to each individual attitude and reaction, to each scene of that tense drama Tacitus unrolls with such skill. Such factors, to name only the most obvious, were the Emperor's profound knowledge of men, experience in administration, and philosophy of government; the ever-widening interests and ambitions of the Imperial Party; the dynamics of the Imperial bureaucracy; and the social forces responsible for the problems in business, religion, the family, the structure of the ruling class, and the composition of the urban proletariat.

The chapter on Economic Conditions (eleventh and last) is a compilation of a few bare facts. Since it makes no attempt to dig into those treasure houses of information represented by epigraphy, numismatics, and papyrology, it fails to introduce any item not known before or to shed new light on old problems. It takes into account one inscription only (*C. I. L.*, X, 7489), but that inscription is picked up in a recent secondary work (p. 250, n. 167). Ten or twelve references to Mattingly, *Roman Coins*, and *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, Vol. I, make it clear that, while utilizing a few data of a general numismatic character, Smith does not bother to examine any of the hundreds of issues minted during the reign of Tiberius. The principal weakness of the author's approach to the problem of economic conditions is, as in the problem of the Senate, his unconcern with the reasons why certain measures were taken, his unawareness that, unless he can get at the underlying policy, the isolated economic facts of which he speaks have scarcely any meaning in themselves or any interest for us.



The Index itself reveals the serious gaps of this book. So many of the subjects and problems with which modern students of the Roman Empire have grown familiar are not listed. For example, one will search in vain for Army, Legions, Legionaries, *Auxilia*, or Military Policy; Navy or Fleet; Freedmen or Slaves; Civil Service, Secretariat, or Chancery; *Patrimonium*, Procurators, *Aerarium*, or Treasury; *Collegium* or *Collegia*, Banking or Money; *Cives*, *Civitas*, Citizenship, Franchise, Enfranchisement (*C.I.L.*, V, 5050, and XIII, 1668 are nowhere mentioned), *Latini*, *Latini Iuniani*, *Ius Latii*, or *Peregrini*; Cults, Mystery Cults, Oriental Religions, Worship; Ruler Worship, Emperor Worship, Deification, Apotheosis, or *Damnatio Memoriae*; *Lex Papia Poppaea* or Social Policy; Frontier, Client Kings, or Vassal States.

One might expect a reference to Jesus or Pontius Pilate especially after the publication of Papini's article, "Il Cesare della Crocifissione," *Nuova Antologia*, CCCLXXI (1934), pp. 40-56. There is no mention either of Art, Letters, Philosophy, or Law, although the title of this book suggests that the Empire is an object of study as much as Tiberius himself, and the author presents his work as "a general history of the reign" (p. iii). Data for some fascinating pages on the artistic and intellectual life at the time of Tiberius are fortunately available. On the Emperor's artistic tastes, for example, Carcopino has something to say in "Attideia," *Mél. Arch. Hist.*, XL (1923), pp. 267-89. On his attitude towards a certain industrial invention there is Petronius, *Sat.*, 51; Pliny, *N.H.*, XXXVI, 66; Dio, LVII, 21, 7. On his liberality to artists and men of letters we have again Dio, LVII, 21, 6; Tacitus, *Ann.*, III, 49, 1; and Suetonius, *Tib.*, 42, 2. There is surely no need for recalling the Vienna Cameo, or the Grand Camée de France, or other well known monuments of the period. But all this material is unknown to Smith.

Although there is a reference to astrologers (p. 272), the only information is the statement that "astrologers and magicians were banished from Italy" (p. 172), and that Aemilia Lepida was charged with making "contacts with astrologers in order to work evil on the imperial house" (p. 173). Nothing else on this social phenomenon so characteristic of the climate of superstition, idleness, and mischief in the Early Empire, so characteristic too of the immigration, underworld, and underground problems facing the City of Rome.

In spite of a reference (p. 21, n. 42) to Rostovtzeff, "L'empereur Tibère et le culte impérial," *Rev. Hist.*, CLXIII (1930), the problem of Emperor worship is completely neglected. Gythium is mentioned only to show that the third day of an unspecified annual festival there was devoted to honoring Livia. Needless to say, there are no other references to the large set of problems raised by the Gythium inscription or the several studies dealing with them, for example: S. B. Kougéas, in *Ἑλληνικά*, I (1928), pp. 7-44 and 152-7; H. Seyrig, "Inscriptions de Gythion," *Rev. Arch.*, ser. V, XXX (1929), pp. 84-106; E. Kornemann, "Neue Dokumente zum lakonischen Kaiserkult," *Abhandl. der Schles. Ges. für vaterländische Cultur*, I (1929); R. Herzog's critique of Kornemann in *Zeitschr. d. Savigny-Stiftung*, L (1930), pp. 628-33; L. Wenger, "Griechische Inschriften zum Kaiserkult und zum Grabrecht," *ibid.*, XLIX

(1929), pp. 308-44, to mention only the earlier studies; or the bibliographical article by M. A. Levi, "Culto imperiale e genesi della monarchia augustea," *Riv. Stor. Ital.*, ser. V, III (1938), pp. 1-13.

As a matter of fact a close examination of the bibliography reveals that the author's claim that he "is not unfamiliar with the literature on Tiberius' reign" (p. iii), is not borne out by the evidence. Far too many essential works have been ignored, for example: J. C. Tarver, *Tiberius the Tyrant* (London, 1902); A. H. Krappe, "Tiberius and Thrasyllus," *A. J. P.*, XLVIII (1927), pp. 359-66 (a significant omission since the author mentions astrologers and magicians); F. B. Marsh, "Tiberius and the Development of the Early Empire," *C. J.*, XXIV (1928-1929), pp. 14-27; K. Scott, "The *Diritas* of Tiberius," *A. J. P.*, LIII (1932), pp. 139-51; G. Pellegrino, *In difesa di Tiberio* (Padua, 1933); E. Ciaceri, *Tiberio, successore di Augusto* (Milan, 1934); J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *The Emperor Gaius (Caligula)* (Oxford, 1934); R. S. Rogers, *Criminal Trials and Criminal Legislation under Tiberius* (Middletown, Conn., 1935 [American Philological Association, *Philological Monographs*, VI]); or J. H. Thiel, "Kaiser Tiberius. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis seiner Persönlichkeit," *Mnemos.*, ser. III, II (1935), pp. 245-70; III (1935-1936), pp. 177-218; IV (1936-1937), pp. 17-42.

We have seen that a whole chapter is devoted to the German campaigns. Yet no notice is taken of such old landmarks as D. Detlefsen, "Ueber des älteren Plinius Geschichte seiner Zeit und ihr Verhältnis zum Tacitus," *Philol.*, XXXIV (1876), pp. 40-9, or F. Münzer, "Die Quellen des Tacitus für die Germanenkriege," *Bonner Jahrbücher*, XIV (1899), or of the newer studies by R. B. Motzo, "I libri della guerra di Germania di Aufidius Basso," *Studi Cagliaritari di Storia e Filologia*, I (Cagliari, 1927); or F. A. Marx, "Die Quellen der Germanenkriege bei Tacitus und Dio," *Klio*, XXVI (1933), pp. 323-9, and "Aufidius Bassus," *ibid.*, XXIX (1936), pp. 94-101.

The Rumanian D. M. Pippidi has long been interested in Tiberius, but none of his contributions has been taken into account, neither his reviews of Marsh's *Reign of Tiberius* (*Rev. Ét. Lat.*, X [1932], pp. 282-7), or of Ciaceri's *Tiberio successore* (*ibid.*, XII [1934], pp. 467-71), or of Pellegrino's *In difesa* (*Revista Clasica* [Bucharrest], 1934-1935, pp. 224 ff.); nor his articles, "Tibère et Arruntius," *Atheneum* (Jassy), I (1935), pp. 1-8, and "Tacite et Tibère," *Ephemeris Dacoromana* (Rome), VIII (1938), pp. 1-68 (Tacitus' Tiberius is not an historical, but a literary and romantic creation), nor any of his excellent studies on Emperor worship, some of which, like "Notes sur le culte impérial (Tac. *Ann.*, I, 78)," *Revista Clasica*, 1930, pp. 25-35, and "La date de l'Ara Numinis Augusti de Rome," *Rev. Ét. Lat.*, XI (1933), pp. 435-56, give considerable attention to Tiberius.

Not very long ago S. J. De Laet published a survey of literature on Tiberius for the period 1914-1937, "Hedendaagsche Stroomingen in de Studie der Geschiedenis van Keizer Tiberius (1914/1937)," *L'Antiquité Classique*, VII (1938), pp. 93-104 and 333-42. Although by no means exhaustive, since its character is highly selective and its interest practically limited to problems handed down from the literary sources, it is nonetheless fundamental for any modern treat-

ment of Tiberius. Yet it has been overlooked just as much as the earlier bibliography by M. Fluss, "Bericht über die Literatur zur Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit von Tiberius bis auf Diocletian (14-284 n. Chr.) aus den Jahren 1894-1913," Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, CLXXXIX (1921), pp. 53-117. Of recent works, not included in De Laet's bibliography, or published after its appearance, I have looked in vain for the following in Smith: M. P. Charlesworth, "The Virtues of a Roman Emperor: Propaganda and the Creation of Belief," The Raleigh Lecture on History, 1937, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, XXIII (1937), pp. 105-133; Lily Ross Taylor, "Tiberius' *Ovatio* and the *Ara Numinis Augusti*," *A. J. P.*, LVIII (1937), pp. 185-93; F. A. Marx, "Der Prozess des Historikers Cremutius Cordus," *Das Gymnasium*, XLVIII (1937), pp. 140-5, and "Tacitus und die Literatur der exitus illustrium virorum," *Philol.*, XCII (1937-1938), pp. 83-103 (a strange omission—these two studies—in a book which has sixteen pages on prosecutions); Pippidi's "Tacite et Tibère," already mentioned; L. Banal, *Cesare Germanico* (Turin, 1938); A. Neppi Modona's sympathetic study of the Emperor's eastern policy in *Atti del IV Congresso Nazionale degli Studi Romani* (Rome, Istituto di Studi Romani, 1938); C. V. Sutherland, "Two 'Virtues' of Tiberius: A Numismatic Contribution to the History of his Reign," *J. R. S.*, XXVIII (1938), pp. 129-40; H. Lohrlich, *Vom Sieg der Sugambres bis zu Armins Befreiungstat*, and *Von den Feldzügen des Germanicus bis zur Batavererhebung* (Leipzig, 1938), which should find their proper place in the chapter on the German campaigns; B. Saria, "Emona als Ständlager der Legio XV Apollinaris," in *Laureae Aquincenses Memoriae Valentini Kuzsinszky Dicatae*, I = *Dissertationes Pannonicae*, Ser. II, No. 10 (Budapest, 1938), pp. 245-55 (Tiberius made that town a *colonia* upon the transfer of the legion to Carnuntum); and J. Szilágyi's study of the garrison at Aquincum under Tiberius, "Die römische Okkupation von Aquincum," *ibid.*, pp. 287-311. It would not perhaps be fair to expect in a work published in September, 1942 the inclusion of W. Allen, Jr., "The Political Atmosphere of the Reign of Tiberius," *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.*, LXXII (1941), pp. 1-25. But why not A. E. Pappano, "Agrippa Postumus," *Class. Phil.*, XXXVI (1941), pp. 30-45; or C. G. Starr, Jr., *The Roman Imperial Navy, 31 B. C.-A. D. 324* (Ithaca, N. Y., 1941), which has very important material?

This considerable body of literature some of which is of real and lasting merit cannot be waved aside with the statement: "Not all recent views and interpretations have been accepted . . . simply because they happen to be challenging or novel" (p. iii). Eager students would have been grateful if the author of *Tiberius and the Roman Empire* had showed which of these witnesses is specious and why. There is another angle to this problem. Reiterating that he "has attempted to avoid the mistake of considering the last word as necessarily the true one," the author announces that he "has endeavored to present an account of the reign which to him seems most closely to approximate the truth" (pp. iii-iv). The account is there all right, but the criteria for selecting it, and the reasons why it approximates the truth, have escaped this reviewer.

Careless or downright inaccurate statements in *Tiberius and the Roman Empire* are many. The phrase that in 27 B. C. Octavian intended "to renounce all powers except those normally vested in the consulship" (p. 2) is misleading. To cite one example only, he had no intention of giving up the *tribunicia potestas*, an office which had no relation whatever to the consulship. Equally misleading is the statement that in "a second abdication ceremony in 23 B. C." (but is abdication the right word?) he "received investment with tribunician powers" (p. 3). These powers had been originally received in 36 B. C. and never resigned, but nowhere does Smith recall it, nor does he specify just what it was that happened in 23 B. C. Germanicus was not the son of Drusus and Agrippina (p. 10), but the son of Drusus and Antonia Minor. Tiberius did not withdraw to Rhodes "to avoid the impossible situation created by the births of Gaius and Lucius" (p. 29). These gentlemen were born in 20 B. C. and 17 B. C. respectively while Tiberius' self-imposed exile took place in 6 B. C. Q. Junius Blaesus had not "served as governor of Sicily and as consul" (p. 37, n. 2), but as consul first and governor next. There never was any danger of the infant Caligula falling "into the hands of the Gauls" (p. 52) who were friendly; the sentence should read, "into the hands of the Germans." *Insula Batavorum* (Tacitus, *Ann.*, II, 6, 4) is not "the [non-existent] isle of Batavia" (p. 69), but "the Rhine Delta." The meaning of "the ordination of Gaius" (p. 145) escapes this reviewer. A reference to p. 219, occurring under "Manius Ennius" (Index, p. 273), belongs instead to "Lucius Ennius" (*ibid.*). It is not enough to speak of "*Lex Julia*" (pp. 168-70, 179, 275), for there are several *leges Juliae* and each is best cited by a specific indication of its contents, e. g., *Lex Julia de maiestate* which is the one Smith has in mind. "*Lepida Aemilia*" (p. 173) had better read "*Aemilia Lepida*."

Coming down to smaller items, one would not expect "in *loc. cit.*" in a book on Roman history. "*Infra*" is correctly used for below several times, but for above on p. 29, n. 65; p. 217, n. 11; p. 219, n. 25; p. 252, n. 190 (on p. 136, n. 17, there occurs, "*Infra*, 000," but accidents of course will happen). On p. 148, n. 61, one reads "*praefectus vigiliū*" instead of "*praefectus vigillum*," and on p. 8 and *passim* "Posthumus" instead of "Postumus." The form, "*lex sicariis*" (p. 275), instead of the full, definite, precise, and grammatically correct form, "*lex Cornelia de sicariis et veneficiis*," is a good example of the vagueness and carelessness one meets with in this book. At one point (p. 109), there appears the doubly objectionable phrase, "the Sullan law of *lex sicariis*." "*In solo provinciale*" takes the place (pp. 250 [twice], 266) of "*in solo provinciali*."

The good practice of using the lower case in French and Italian titles is generally adhered to, but frequently abandoned when the adjective *romain* or *romano* comes up (pp. 258, 259 in three different titles, 260, 265, 267, 268). This lack of standardization is more glaring in German titles. On p. 257, next to the correct form, "der römischen Kaiserzeit," appears the form, "der Römischen Staatsverfassung." The error reappears in the titles of other works on pp. 258, 260 (twice), 263 (eight times), 265 (twice), 267, and 270.



Accents are an esoteric science for Smith. "Maestà" (p. 260) appears without any accent, "responsabilità" (p. 265) and "civiltà" (p. 268) with the wrong one. He writes "Parvan" (pp. 235, 262, 268) instead of "Pârvan," "impots" (p. 259) instead of "impôts," "recentes" (p. 265) instead of "récentes," "Palmyreniens" (p. 265) instead of "palmyréniens," "senatoriale" (p. 266) instead of "sénatoriale" (see also p. 203, n. 75; and p. 260), "avènement" (p. 266) instead of "avênement." "Tiberè" instead of "Tibère" appears with maddening regularity throughout the book. In a title of seven words there are packed six mistakes: "Une séance du Senate Romain sous Tiberè" (p. 268) instead of "Une séance du sénat romain sous Tibère." We were not ready for such fumbling from Baton Rouge of all places.

Misspellings of foreign words occur frequently, e. g., the impossible combination, "*Monumenta Antiques*" (pp. 133, 265); or "Cremuzeo" (127, 265) for "Cremuzio," "*Communale*" (161, 265) for "*Comunale*," "*senatorials*" (p. 260) for "*sénatoriales*," "Dioclétian" (p. 262) for "Diocletien," "der K. Bayerische Akademie" (p. 263) for "der K. Bayerischen Akademie," "Die effective Mitregenschaft" (p. 266) for "Die effektive Mitregentschaft," "Lange" (p. 261) for "Lang," "Dexler" (p. 266) for "Drexler," "von Kaiser Tiberius" (p. 267) for "vom Kaiser Tiberius," "in" for "im" as "in J. 16 n. Chr." (p. 261) or "in römischen Heere" (p. 268), also "in römische Kaiserreiche" (pp. 235, 262) instead of "im römischen Kaiserreiche." Three misspellings crowd up in one title: "*Untersuchen über die Schlacht im Teutoburga Wald*" (p. 262) instead of "*Untersuchungen über die Schlacht im Teutoburger Walde*." (See also "Kuthman, C., *Zur Schlacht im Teutoburger Wald*" [p. 261] instead of "Küthmann, C., *Zur Schlacht im Teutoburger Walde*.") There occur also the following misspellings or misprints, whatever they are: "Travastere" (pp. 230, 280) for "Trastevere," "Zuydersee" (pp. 63, 69) and "Zuyderzee" (p. 281) for "Zuider Zee." "Financial Crisis of 31 A. D." (p. 254, n. 211) is clearly a misprint (for "Financial Crisis of 33 A. D."), and so is "Caesarinian" (p. 26, n. 52).

Words are missing in several titles: "*Cappadocia as a Roman Province*" (p. 260) instead of "*Cappadocia as a Roman Procuratorial Province*," "Fouilles recentes en Tunisie" (p. 265) instead of "Fouilles et découvertes récentes en Tunisie," "Le viol rituel les Romains" (pp. 149, 267) instead of "Le viol rituel chez les romains," "The Expulsion of the Jews under Tiberius" (p. 268) instead of "The Expulsion of Jews from Rome under Tiberius."

Certain titles are incomplete or arbitrary or both, e. g., "*Descriptions historiques de monnaies*, 3 vols., (Paris, 1880)" (p. 257), instead of "*Description historique des monnaies frappées sous l'empire romain*, 2 ed., 8 vols. (Paris, 1880-1892)"; "Divus Augustus" (p. 266) instead of "Divus Augustus. L'idée dynastique chez les empereurs julio-claudiens"; "*Some Aspects of Roman History*" (p. 261) instead of "*Aspects of the Study of Roman History*." To "Ueber die Einführung des provinzialen Kaisereultus" (p. 267), should be added "im römischen Westen." Other titles emerge with some words added: "Tacitus and the Aristocratic Tradition" (p.



267) instead of "Tacitus and Aristocratic Tradition," "Tiberius' Refusal of the Title of Augustus" (p. 269) instead of "Tiberius' Refusal of the Title 'Augustus'." "Hohl-Rostock, E." (p. 267) should be "Hohl, E."

Mattingly's *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum* has 4 vols., London, 1923-1940, not "2 vols. (London, 1923)" (p. 262). Mommsen's *Gesammelte Schriften* are not in "6 vols. (Berlin, 1906)" (p. 262), but in "8 vols., Berlin, 1905-1913." Marquardt's *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, 4 vols. (Leipzig, 1881-1885) (p. 258) should be "2 ed., 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1881-1885)." Schott's *Studien zur Geschichte des Kaisers Tiberius* (Bamberg, 1904) (p. 263) should show that the work is in two parts: I, 1904; II, 1905. The date of Spengel's "Zur Geschichte des Kaisers Tiberius [etc.]" (p. 263) is 1903, not 1904. The date of Frank's *Roman Imperialism* (p. 257) is 1914, not 1925. The date of Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, CCXXIV, is 1929, not 1927. The date of *Klio*, XV (p. 266, last line) is 1918, not 1917; it is given correctly on the fifth line of the same page. The date of Ferguson's article, "Legalized Absolutism en Route from Greece to Rome," *Amer. Hist. Rev.* XVIII (p. 266) is 1912-1913, not 1913; that of Westermann's article, "The Economic Basis of the Decline of Ancient Culture," *loc. cit.*, XX (p. 270) is 1914-1915, not 1915-1916. But enough of this tiresome job except to note that the mistakes we have enumerated are apparently not due to careless printing or careless proof reading. For not in that way can one account for the amazing fact that each mistake is repeated again and again and again with unfailing regularity. E.g., the accursed form "Tiberè" appears always the same on pp. 260, 265, 266, 268, 269 (bibliography section) for a total of six titles, and in the footnotes appended to the text on pp. 14, 19, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, at which point I stopped counting. "Kriegzüge" systematically omits the s of the possessive genitive on p. 58, n. 3; p. 61, n. 10; p. 63, nn. 16-17; p. 65, n. 22; p. 74, n. 48; p. 76, n. 51 as well as on p. 261. "Untersuchen" instead of "Untersuchungen" recurs in two different titles on pp. 262 and 263, and in the reference to each on p. 64, n. 17, and p. 95, n. 88.

Though only a few years old, the Louisiana State University Press has made outstanding contributions to literature and scholarship in America. The publication of *Tiberius and the Roman Empire* is one of those unfortunate fouls that cannot be avoided in any game. As to Professor Smith, he has written other books, setting an example of energy in surroundings where it is not always easy to work. He is young and industrious, and he will delight his friends when he publishes another work without haste and without too much self-assurance.

VINCENT M. SCRAMUZZA.

SMITH COLLEGE.

GISELA M. A. RICHTER. *Etruscan Art in the Museum. The Metropolitan Museum of Art: Handbook of the Etruscan Collection.* New York, 1940. Pp. xxiv + 86; 18 drawings, 173 figs., one map. \$2.00.

This is an historical and artistic study which amounts to more than a handbook of the Etruscan Collection in the Metropolitan Museum. Miss Richter rightly says (p. xiv), "Most of our acquisitions have been selected for their artistic merit and so include examples of the foremost importance. The collection, therefore, though small compared with the impressive displays in the Villa Giulia Museum in Rome and the Archaeological Museum in Florence, affords an excellent picture of the greatness of Etruscan Art." In the collection are masterpieces of Etruscan art as good as any in Italy itself or as those in the British Museum or in the Ny-Carlsberg Glyptothek in Copenhagen. The Metropolitan Museum deserves much praise for having secured such great things as the chariot from Monteleone near Spoleto (Figs. 58-62) and the gold fibula from Rusellae, one of the finest specimens of Etruscan goldwork, with animals in gold-dust technique (Figs. 27, 29),<sup>1</sup> such excellent vases, gems, bronze mirrors, and cistae, the bronze winged Lasa (Fig. 161), and especially three painted terracotta sculptures, two statues of warriors, one of heroic size and one life-size, and a colossal head from a third statue.<sup>2</sup> These statues rank among the most distinguished that we have from Etruria and outrank the Veii Apollo and Artemis in the Villa Giulia Museum. There are no better examples of Etruria's prime and of the triumphant strength and splendor and military prowess of the Etruscans. Miss Richter's earlier publication of them was better, however, and the illustrations larger.<sup>3</sup> She gives no provenience, but I saw these warriors more than thirty years ago in Chiusi and believe that they come from the neighborhood of Chiusi and not from Veii.

<sup>1</sup> Miss Richter does not refer in her bibliography on this fibula, p. 14, n. 11, to Montelius, *La Civilisation Primitive en Italie*, II, 2, Pl. 378, 1a and b, where the same two illustrations are reproduced. To Miss Richter's parallels (p. 9) from the Bernardini and Barberini tombs and the Lictor's tomb at Vetulonia, add Hanfmann, "The Etruscans and their Art," *Bull. Mus. Art, Rhode Island School of Design*, XXVIII (1940), pp. 10-11, Figs. 10-11 (mid-seventh century B. C.), an ornate granulated gold fibula in Providence, R. I., a miracle of precision, with twenty-eight figures including all sorts of animals and fantastic demons and monsters. Nothing could illustrate Etruscan luxury and technical skill better than this fibula, a product of the famous Etruscan Vetulonian school of goldsmith work.

<sup>2</sup> The warrior in Fig. 50 is dated as early as 520, rather than 500 B. C., by Matz, *Gnomon*, XV (1939), p. 452, who thinks that the Metropolitan terracotta warriors are older than the terracottas from Veii in the Villa Giulia. The colossal head (Fig. 51) Miss Richter rightly interprets as Mars. Cf. Norden, *Aus altitalischen Priesterbüchern* (1939), p. 274.

<sup>3</sup> In the *Papers* of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, No. 6, 1937.

The text of the volume is condensed but readable. There are many learned footnotes, some of which are original contributions in themselves. There is an excellent bibliography, though I miss such books as Martha, *L'Art Étrusque* (1889); Hausenstein, *Die Bildnerei der Etrusker* (1922); Poulsen, *Katalog des Etruskischen Museums der Ny-Carlsberg Glyptothek* (1927); Mühlestein, *Die Kunst der Etrusker* (1929); Bulanda, *Etrurja i Etruskowie* (1934); Hanfmann, "The Etruscans and their Art," *Bulletin of the Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design*, XXVIII, 1 (July, 1940); Ryberg, *An Archaeological Record of Rome from the Seventh to the Second Century B. C.* (1940) [these last two published only about six months before Miss Richter's book]. For Lydian inscriptions from Sardis a reference is given to *Sardis*, VI, 1 (Littmann), but a reference should also be made to Buckler, "Lydian Inscriptions," *Sardis*, VI, 2 (1924). A reference is also needed to Scribner, "A Catalogue of the Spang Collection of Greek and Italian Vases and Etruscan Urns in the Carnegie Museum," *Memoirs of the Carnegie Museum*, XI, 6 (Pittsburgh, 1937), where on Pl. XLIII, 3, is reproduced an Etruscan urn with a scene exactly like that in Miss Richter's Figure 143: <sup>4</sup> "Perhaps Echetlos at the battle of Marathon, who slaughtered many of the barbarians with a plough" (p. 49, Pausanias, I, 32, 5). The urn in Pittsburgh has a different inscription from that in New York but the same first name as another urn in New York (Fig. 144), Thana. This occurs also on a second urn in Pittsburgh,<sup>5</sup> both inscriptions discussed by the late Eva Fiesel and George Hanfmann in Scribner, *loc. cit.*, p. 339. Hanfmann and Hoenigswald have helped Miss Richter interpret the Etruscan inscriptions (pp. 50, 56-7) with suggestions important to philologists and especially to Etruscologists. Miss Milne (p. xxii) makes the interesting suggestion that the Olynthian 8 (= *ἐκατόν*) was a variant of *Θ* introduced into Etruria by the Chalcidians, but I should prefer to believe that the Etruscan 8 came from the Lydian 8 as found in inscriptions at Sardis.

For the bronze hut-urn (p. 2, Fig. 3) a reference might have been given to Bryan, *Italic Hut Urns and Hut Urn Cemeteries* (1925), where, however, I find no reference to the one in the Metropolitan Museum. Miss Richter says: "Ours is the only example in bronze," and that may be true of the oval shape, but there are plenty of bronze Etruscan hut urns, cf. Montelius, *op. cit.*, II, 1, Pl. 188, 1a and b; II, 2, Pls. 241, 14; 308, 8; *Mon. Ant.*, XV, Figs. 189c, 189d. A vase similar to Fig. 137 in the form of a duck with the representation of a Lasa, which I bought in 1901 in Benghazi, is in my collection (cf. *C. V. A., Robinson Coll.*, Fasc. 3, Pl. XXXVIII, 2, and p. 50, with many parallels and references). They seem to date from the

<sup>4</sup> In my collection is an urn with another replica of the same scene and a cover with an *obesus Etruscus* (Catullus, XXXIX, 11). The scene might be Etruscan and represent Tarchon with the plough defending the Etruscans against invasion; cf. Roscher, *Lexikon*, I, p. 1212; Müller-Deecke, *Die Etrusker*, II, pp. 283-4. Another replica I have noticed in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts.

<sup>5</sup> A duplicate of Scribner, *loc. cit.*, Pl. XLII, 3, with the combat of Eteocles and Polynices is in the Johns Hopkins Archaeological Museum.

fourth century B. C., and it is strange to find one in the Cyrenaica, but Etruscan things have been found even in sixth-century tombs at Carthage.

Miss Richter gives a detailed discussion of the origin of the Etruscans (pp. xiv-xix) and concludes: "On this manifold evidence, therefore, it seems reasonable to suppose that the Etruscans were, as Herodotos tells us, an Eastern people, that they came by sea to western Italy, landing, however, not as a single large invading army but in successive detachments." Miss Richter gives an excellent and exhaustive bibliography of the subject. To those who uphold the indigenous origin (Last, Pareti, etc.) might be added Messerschmidt and Hempl, who thought that Etruscan was an Italic dialect.<sup>6</sup> In view of my studies at Sardis and elsewhere in Asia Minor and in Italy, I find it impossible to detect any conclusive evidence that the Etruscans were autochthonous and I agree with Miss Richter's eight arguments (pp. xv-xvi)<sup>7</sup> and with Randall-MacIver, who prefer Herodotus of Asia Minor to the *ipse dixit* of a Greek writer of the Augustan Age, Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In the discussion of fibulae, the violin type is dated too early, 1500-1200 B. C. It prevails from the tenth to the seventh century B. C. *Olynthus*, X, appeared too late for Miss Richter to use,<sup>8</sup> but Blinkenberg's *Fibules grecques et orientales* might have been cited. For the bronze leaf (p. 30 and Fig. 93) see *Olynthus*, X, pp. 52-3, where I refer to the Metropolitan example. It may have been part of a wreath.

There are no large Etruscan sarcophagi or Etruscan paintings in the Metropolitan, but other fields of Etruscan art are well represented and well illustrated. Nowhere can be found a saner short story of the Etruscans. This is a masterpiece of scholarship and yet it is an interesting book written in Miss Richter's inimitable, admirable, and authoritative way. It is indispensable to all Etruscologists and to others who want to know about the Etruscans and Etruscan problems.

DAVID M. ROBINSON.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Hempl, "Early Etruscan Inscriptions" (*Matzke Memorial Volume* [Stanford University, 1911]), and a long manuscript by him on the Etruscans, which has not been published as planned, so far as I know. After Miss Richter's book appeared, and probably inspired by her, a symposium was held at the Metropolitan Museum on "Who were the Etruscans?" Summaries of the papers are published in *A. J. A.*, XLVII (1943), pp. 91-101. It is to be regretted that no summary was published of the long discussion of the problem by Doro Levi, who by request presented arguments supporting the indigenous origin. He writes me, however, that he is "rather inclined to the oriental theory."

<sup>7</sup> Too much stress, however, is laid by Miss Richter (p. xv) on the marked increase (about the middle of the eighth century) of trench tombs with inhumations and the gradual disappearance thereafter of the earlier well tombs with cremations. Cf. Säföund's important article, "Bemerkungen zur Vorgeschichte Etruriens," *Studi Etruschi*, XII (1938), pp. 17-55.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *Studi Etruschi*, XII (1938), p. 39; XIII (1939), pp. 85 ff.; on fibulae in general, *Olynthus*, X, pp. 95-115, with many parallels and references.

LAMBERTUS JOACHIM ELFERINK. *Het Oordeel van den Kerkvader Augustinus over de Romeinsche Oudheid. Bijdragen tot een commentaar op de eerste vijf boeken van "De Civitate Dei."* Pretoria, S. A., J. L. Van Schaik, 1942. Pp. 148; 1 plate. 15s.

The "Judgment of the Church Father Augustine on Roman Antiquity" was originally the prize-winning essay at the Vrije Universiteit of Amsterdam in 1929. In its present expanded form the *ipsissima verba* of the first five books of the *De Civitate Dei* are the writings principally searched for the judgments on "the good acts of infidels and pagans" which stirred up such acrimonious theological debates in the 16th and 17th centuries. In the dissertation under examination the same arguments are also a substantial part. In spite of this there are many points of general and philological interest. In particular the careful reading and exegesis of the text of Augustine will commend itself to the classical scholar. This procedure is many times in the course of the development an occasion for corrections of opinions supported by distinguished scholars. A very good example is the clarification of the term "Civitas Dei." Another is the correct explanation of St. Augustine's attitude toward the Roman Empire (cf. p. 123, n. 45 where the contrary opinion of H. Fuchs is refuted). A cursory inspection of the alphabetical index will further reveal that the author is thoroughly aware of the existence of scholars outside the Continent—even in America! Thus, though Elferink does not share the opinions of the late Tenney Frank on the "Import of the Fetal Institution" (*Class. Phil.*, VII [1912], p. 335) he is fair and objective in the presentation of his point of view (cf. p. 115, n. 17). This same honorable dissent is manifest in the discussion of American work in several other portions of the dissertation (cf. p. 125, n. 43: the discussion of the meaning of the word "philosophaster"). In this connection it must also be said that Elferink shows an awareness of the principal work accomplished in any part of the world—and the mass of notes (pp. 114-32) in very small print attests that the lists of references are not "padding." The principal finding of this dissertation, however, is that St. Augustine in his attitude toward ancient Rome, as well as toward other pagans and infidels, is quite as much the *doctor perditionis* as the *doctor gratiae*. The good deeds of infidels are *splendentia vitia*. This is not an Augustinian expression but amply borne out by other statements that give a handle to the Calvinistic and Lutheran, not to speak of the Jansenist interpretations of the Bishop of Hippo. As Elferink says, the whole matter is "uitermatie periculeus." In this review only a few remarks can be made on this subject. Whatever the mature thought of St. Augustine was, it is manifestly incorrect to assert by implication an equation between *all* the theological opinions of St. Augustine and Catholic dogma (cf. p. 81 where the over-harsh pronouncements of the Bishop are set against the position of "het latere katholicisme"). A complete summary with adequate references to the opinion of competent theological authority from the beginning to modern times shows that always—to use the formulary of Suarez (Proleg. 6, c. 6, n. 14 ff.)—"Sententia Augustini praeferenda est, nisi cum maior Patrum aut Ecclesiae auctoritas obstare videtur, quod raro aut numquam continget." (Cf. *De Gratia, Trac-*



*tatus Dogmaticus quem scripsit* Hermannus Lange, S. J. [Friburgi Brisgoviae, 1929], pp. 67-70, nn. 111-16, especially n. 116.) The references adduced (cf. Lange, *loc. cit.*) must suffice to show that early or late St. Augustine's stand was not and is not the authoritative Catholic position. This is represented best by the *Indiculus of Caelestinus I* (Denziger-Bannwart, S. J. and I. Umberg, S. J., *Enchiridion Symbolorum, Definitionum et Declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, Ed. 16 et 17 [Friburgi Brisgoviae, 1911], N. 128). Since it has so often been the authoritative pronouncement for Catholics from May 431 to the present time it may not be amiss to quote the pertinent passages: "Cap. 2. Augustinum sanctae recordationis virum pro vita sua atque meritis in nostra communione semper habuimus, . . ." There follow points of doctrine on which the lead of St. Augustine is followed. Then the qualification: "Cap. 13. Profundiores vero difficiliioresque partes incurrentium quaestionum (on Predestination), quas latius pertrectarunt qui haereticis restiterunt (principally Augustine whom the Gallic bishops respectfully begged to abandon on some "duriore sententiae") sicut non audemus contemnere ita non necesse habemus adstruere, quia ad confitendum gratiam Dei, cuius operi ac dignationi nihil penitus subtrahendum est, satis sufficere credimus, quidquid secundum praedictas regulas (the several capita from 3-12) Apostolicae Sedis nos scripta docuerunt . . ." One word more on the purely dogmatic aspects of a question so intimately linked with the whole. Elferink has devoted the better part of the fifth chapter (*Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*) to refuting the conciliatory attempts of J. Ernst (*Die Werke und Tugenden der Unglaubigen* [Freiburg, 1871]). This is primarily a matter of terminology. Not to be excessive, the following summary of a summary (Lange, *op. cit.*, p. 65, n. 110) must suffice. The modern theological writers completely eschew words like *vitia* and *peccata* in speaking of the "naturally" good (i. e. not ordained to a supernatural end) works of infidels. The *Indiculus* remains, the formulation is different. In spite of these strictures the work of Elferink deserves to be read by philologists. Lucidity of style, orderliness in the discussion, and comprehensiveness in its bibliography give it real distinction. Its "parerga" are not the least of the merits that will commend it to the Patristic scholar and the philologist.

J. M. F. MARIQUE, S. J.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY.

HELENE WEISS. *Kausalität und Zufall in der Philosophie des Aristoteles*. Basel, Verlag Haus zum Falken, 1942. Pp. 198.

The author of this study has selected certain passages from Aristotle's *Physics*, *Metaphysics*, and *Ethics*, which she professes to interpret in terms of Heidegger's "phenomenological" philosophy. Some parts of the book, indeed, utilize interpretations of Aristotle presented by Heidegger in his lectures and seminars for the years 1923-26 (note, p. 52). The most conspicuous feature of the author's approach to Aristotle is the preoccupation with "ontology." Following Heidegger, she regards ontology as the central philosophical problem not only for Aristotle but for Greek philosophers in general.

"Eigentliche Ontologie ist Philosophie" (note, p. 52). Even ethics is basically an ontological problem (p. 130). Predication, also, is interpreted in close relation to ontology (pp. 188-90). The main philosophical terms used in this monograph reflect the ontological emphasis: "ontisch," "ontologisch," "Grund," "Phänomen."

As a result of the author's "phenomenological" point of view, her interpretations of Aristotle are curiously distorted. For example, on pp. 25-8, after having argued that in one context Aristotle speaks of "being" as "one," and elsewhere as "many," she attributes to Aristotle the remark that "das Seiende . . . (obwohl es Eines ist) zugleich Vielheit ist." Likewise on p. 58, in reference to Aristotle's remark that the term *φύσις* is used sometimes of "matter" and sometimes of "form," she concludes that according to Aristotle nature is "sowohl Hyle als auch Eidos." Still other examples of this tendency to confuse modes of expression with modes of being may be found on p. 187, where the relation of substance to accident is identified with the relation of subject to predicate, and on pp. 127-8, where we find that "Nous" is "Phantasia" and is also "Aisthesis" (see also p. 146). One cannot help feeling that Aristotle does not look his best in this Post-Kantian dress.

No serious attempt is made to place Aristotle's works in an exact historical perspective. The chronology of Aristotle's own works is not discussed. The author's main device for explaining the historical source of any particular element in Aristotle's writings is (with the exception of a very few references to Plato) to indulge in fanciful and groundless generalizations about the Greeks as a whole; for instance, that "Für die Griechen das Sein immer schon die Bedeutung des Anwesendseins hatte" (p. 144); "Der Grieche jede *μεταβολή* auffasst als eine Bewegung aus der Ungestaltetheit zur Gestaltung" (p. 62, cf. p. 42); "Die *τέχνη* ist ihnen eine Weise des *ἀληθεύειν*" (p. 54). The influence of Aristotle on later philosophers is occasionally mentioned, and there are numerous comparisons or contrasts between ancient and modern philosophy and science.

Although published in Switzerland, this study was actually printed in England. The assistance of Professors Cornford and Ross is acknowledged in a prefatory note. Their encouragement of European scholarship in the midst of the war is indeed commendable.

PHILLIP DE LACY.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

---

*The Vatnsdalers' Saga.* Translated with an Introduction and Notes by GWYN JONES. Princeton, Princeton Univ. Press (for the American Scandinavian Foundation, New York), 1944. Pp. xii + 158.

Dr. Gwyn Jones is already a familiar name among the translators of the Icelandic sagas. He has already translated three of the sagas dealing with the East of Iceland, among them the little masterpiece, *Hrafnkels saga Freysgoða*, as well as the late and romantic *Kjalnesinga saga*. Now he gives us a version of *Vatnsdæla saga*, which has never

before been translated in full; a partial translation was made by Vigfússon and Powell for the *Origines Islandicae*.

To judge by a check of some twenty-five pages, the translation is well done. In fact, I have not found a single unmistakable error in this part, and not more than one or two places where the translation is, perhaps, less clear than expected (especially: "If our voyage has no greater perils than these, there is nothing else for it but to push ahead like champions" translating: *Ef eigi verða stórar mannraunir í várum ferðum, þá er einsætt að fara með hernaðinum drengilega*. I should prefer: "If we do not run into perilous encounters on our expedition, we should by all means conduct our raids in a fair [courteous] fashion" [p. 33]).

Dr. Jones is not a follower of the Dasent-Morris school of archaic saga-style. His is a modern style where pith and terseness admirably convey the same qualities of the sagas. As far as I can judge, it is also a perfectly good and racy English. In obtaining this result the translator has, at times, naturally had to sacrifice literal adherence to the original. In general the style has become less reserved. There is more directness, more variation, more of exclamation, and less understatement in the translation than in the saga. Yet, I am very much in doubt whether a happier mean between the demands of the two idioms could be struck than that which the translator has achieved.

The translator has furnished his saga with an excellent introduction and notes. The introduction values the saga in terms of heroic literature, Icelandic and foreign, and weighs the literary personality of its author "the priest of Thingeyrar" in relation to his age, the troubled Sturlunga period. One notes with satisfaction that the writer of this essay has profited from the most recent edition of the saga (that of E. Ó. Sveinsson in *Íslensk Fornrit*, VIII [1939]).

The notes are helpful chiefly because they give translations from parallel texts which throw light on our saga, especially bits from *Landnáma* and *Finnboga saga ins ramma*.

Both the introduction and the notes are remarkably free from slips. In the first I have noted *Hrafn Oddason* (p. 3) for *Hrafn Oddsson*, probably a printer's error. In the latter (p. 143) the nickname of *Bergr inn rakki* is explained to be either *rakkr* "straight" or *rakki* "dog." The latter would be possible only if the man were called *Bergr rakki*, since *inn* demands a following adjective, but to my knowledge the variant *Bergr rakki* is not found.

To sum up: Dr. Gwyn Jones has given us a translation of distinction, a credit to the publishers, and a book to be welcomed by all lovers of the sagas.

STEFÁN EINARSSON.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

ALEKSANDER TURYN. *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus*. New York, 1943. Pp. v + 141. \$3. (Polish Institute Series No. 2.)

Professor Turyn, of the University of Warsaw, and now in this country, publishes in this book the results of extensive and meticulous research. He presents a complete list of Aeschylean MSS, subdividing the codices as they now exist, when they are drawn from different sources, and pointing out a case or two of the reverse process—the splitting of a single copy into parts now separately bound. The stemma includes, in Turyn's arrangement, 1) "old" MSS, following the pre-Byzantine tradition, for the seven plays—namely, the Medicean, and the Venetus 468 for the *Agamemnon* only; 2) "old" MSS for the triad *Persians*—*Seven*—*Prometheus*, among which Turyn distinguishes five generations of extant MSS, not counting the missing links; 3) the edition, so to speak, of Thomas Magister, resulting in two classes of extant MSS—the distinction between "old" and Thoman MSS is made by Turyn on the basis of the scholia, arguments, and Life of Aeschylus; 4) a class deriving both from the "old" tradition and from the Thoman recension; and 5) the edition of Triclinius. Turyn regards the Medicean and, say, six or seven MSS of his  $\pi$ -class of the "old" tradition as a satisfactory basis for the text of Aeschylus.

As an extended appendix, the book contains an edition of the scholia on the *Eumenides* found in the Triclinian Naples MS.

This is an essential and well-nigh conclusive book. Turyn has done a painstaking and thorough piece of work. A hint as to his care is given above in the mention of his subdivision of extant MSS. His use of scholarly literature is equally thorough. One receives a definite impression that a task of this sort must be done, not by an Aeschylean scholar turning his attention to the manuscripts, but by a codicist turning his attention to Aeschylus. This impression is based on the cross-references in the book to the manuscripts of Pindar, Sophocles, and others. For the study of Aeschylus, Turyn is prepared to discard most of the documents he has considered; but he seems to regret that he was unable to study a dozen MSS, and could not satisfactorily locate one or two others in the family tree. The precise scholarship and sense of order, which are essential virtues for this task, at times almost become faults by exaggeration. In the absence of cogent evidence, Turyn occasionally rides his reasoning hard—an example may be found on p. 14 in the tracing of the pre-history of the Medicean codex M. Some doubt is stimulated in the reader by the impatience with which Turyn regards manuscripts "contaminated" by the use of more than one type of source—cf. his statement that "manuscripts of a desultory character mislead the reader as to the proper attitude towards a given symbol in the apparatus" and should therefore be set aside in making an edition. Perhaps it would be helpful if all copyists since Aeschylus had been automata, but they were not; and, inasmuch as, before the days of our MSS, copyists probably insisted on using their heads, are not the extant MSS which show signs of headwork worth our notice? The editor-copyist may in fact have gone wrong, but should we summarily dismiss him because he tried to be careful and intelligent?

The English of Turyn's book is just sufficiently non-standard to indicate that it is Turyn's own. As such, it is admirable.

*The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus* should take its place in all institutional libraries and in the personal libraries of students of Aeschylus.

ALFRED C. SCHLESINGER.

OBERLIN COLLEGE.

T. B. L. WEBSTER. *Greek Interpretations*. Manchester, University Press, 1942. Pp. viii + 128.

The announced objects of this little book are two: first, to record certain views of Mr. Webster's on literature and art; and, second, "to propound a method for the teaching of Greek in English—detailed commentary on representative passages of Greek literature set in their peculiar background of history." The history is art-history to a larger extent than might be gathered from the above sentence by itself.

The beginning is, of course, made with Homer; the analogous art is taken to be the Geometric, not that of the Bronze Age. From Homer, we pass to Solon, represented by his philosophical poem on divine justice; there follows a discussion of sixth-century Ionia, emphasizing art and archaeology, with just a little poetry. Thence we move to the Persian War group of Aeschylus, Pindar, and Simonides, and we are therewith settled in Athens till the Hellenistic age. Theocritus represents the Alexandrians, and the *Aeneid*, the Graeco-Roman period.

From the high-lights selected, a considerable amount of radiation is allowed to fall on other literature and art of the various periods, so that from Pindar and Aeschylus, for instance, we look back to Solon, and the Melian Dialogue serves as a center for comment on Euripides, the period of Athenian decline, and the sophists. Plato joins Thucydides as a high-light in prose; at other times, the poets are central.

The views set forth by Webster will not, I believe, seem strange or alarming to scholars. There will be, of course, the standard, inevitable percentage of disagreement; my hackles rise at the statement that "Sophocles has much the same philosophy as Aeschylus"; at least this statement, I fear, would be taken by undergraduates as authoritative and final, precisely because it should arouse distrust and a demand for exegesis. But, on the whole, the scholar will find this a very urbane, polished, and attractive *causerie* about our good friends of olden days. The amateur of classics, I am assured by my favorite classical amateur, will also find this volume good reading. As an example of how to teach Greek in English, it merits careful consideration and testing by experiment. Literature, fine arts, and history are the richest lodes of Hellenic civilization for the average student, and the combination exemplified by Webster might well be a judicious and tasty mixture to offer to a class. The literary context might display to advantage the fine arts, which, paradoxically, are difficult for a class in Greek civilization properly to appreciate.

OBERLIN COLLEGE.

ALFRED C. SCHLESINGER.



## BOOKS RECEIVED.

(It is impossible to review all books submitted to the JOURNAL, but all are listed under BOOKS RECEIVED. Contributions sent for review or notice are not returnable.)

Bolling (George Melville). *The Athetized Lines of the Iliad*. Baltimore, *Linguistic Society of America*, 1944. Pp. 200. (Special Publ. of the Linguistic Society of America.)

Broneer (Oscar). *The Tent of Xerxes and the Greek Theater*. *Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Archaeology*, I, 12 (1944), pp. 305-312.

Campbell (Joseph) and Robinson (Henry Morton). *A Skeleton Key to Finnegans Wake*. New York, *Harcourt, Brace & Co.*, 1944. Pp. xi + 365.

Cherniss (Harold). *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato and the Academy*, Volume I. Baltimore, *Johns Hopkins Press*, 1944. Pp. xxvii + 610. \$5.00.

Excavations (The) at Dura-Europos. Preliminary Report of the Ninth Season of Work, 1935-1936. Edited by M. I. Rostovtzeff, A. R. Bellinger, F. E. Brown, and C. B. Welles. Part I: The Agora and Bazaar. New Haven, *Yale Univ. Press*, 1944. Pp. xiv + 270; 30 pls. \$5.00.

Fairchild (Arthur H. R.). *Shakespeare and the Tragic Theme*. Columbia, *Univ. of Missouri*, 1944. Pp. 145. \$1.50. (*Univ. of Missouri Studies*, XIX, no. 2.)

Fontenrose (Joseph). *The Festival Called Boegia at Didyma*. *Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Archaeology*, I, 11 (1944), pp. 291-304; pls. 38-40.

Harsh (Philip Whaley). *A Handbook of Classical Drama*. Stanford University, *Stanford Univ. Press*, 1944. Pp. xii + 526. \$4.00.

Jaffee (Harold B.). *Horace: An Essay in Poetic Therapy*. Chicago, 1944. Pp. v + 101. (Univ. of Chicago Diss.)

Jasny (N.). *Wheat Prices and Milling Costs in Classical Rome*. *Wheat Studies of the Food Research Institute, Stanford Univ.*, XX, 4 (March, 1944), pp. 137-170.

Johnson (Carl L.). *Professor Longfellow of Harvard*. Eugene, *Univ. of Oregon Press*, 1944. Pp. xii + 112. (*Univ. of Oregon Monographs, Studies in Literature and Philology*, no. 5.)

Linforth (Ivan M.). *Soul and Sieve in Plato's Gorgias*. *Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Philology*, XII, 17 (1944), pp. 295-314.

Lutz (Cora E.), editor. *Dunchad's Glossae in Martianum*. Lancaster, Pa., *Lancaster Press*, 1944. Pp. xxx + 68. \$1.50. (*Philological Monographs, American Philological Association*, XII.)

Mulloy (William J.). *The German Catholic Estimate of Goethe (1790-1939)*. *Univ. of California Publ. in Modern Philology*, XXIV, 4, pp. 357-458.

Price (Lawrence M.). *The Vogue of Marmontel on the German Stage*. *Univ. of California Publ. in Modern Philology*, XXVII, 2, pp. 27-124.

Richardson (Lawrence). *Poetical Theory in Republican Rome*. New Haven, *Yale Univ. Press*, 1944. Pp. xi + 173. \$1.00. (*Undergraduate Prize Essays, Yale Univ.*, Vol. V.)

Rider (Fremont). *The Scholar and the Future of the Research Library*. New York, *The Hadham Press*, 1944. Pp. xiii + 236. \$4.00.

Sedgefield (W. J.). *Locorum Nonnullorum in Epistulis M. T. Ciceronis mendose descriptorum Emendationes, editio tertia.* London, 1943. Pp. 16.

Smith (H. R. W.). *The Hearst Hydria: An Attic Footnote to Corinthian History.* *Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Archaeology*, I, 10 (1944), pp. 241-290; pls. 33-37.

Smith (William Benjamin) and Miller (Walter). *The Iliad of Homer. A line for line translation in dactylic hexameters.* New York, *Macmillan Co.*, 1944. Pp. xx + 565. \$3.75.

Stirling (M. W.). *Stone Monuments of Southern Mexico.* Washington, *U. S. Gov't. Printing Office*, 1943. Pp. vii + 84; 62 pls.; 14 text figs. \$0.35. (*Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin* 138.)

*Studies in Speech and Drama.* In Honor of Alexander M. Drummond. Ithaca, *Cornell Univ. Press*, 1944. Pp. viii + 472. \$4.50.

Suelzer (Sister Mary J.). *The Clausulae in Cassiodorus.* Washington, *Catholic Univ. of America Press*, 1944. Pp. xv + 47. (*Catholic Univ. of America Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin Language and Literature*, XVII.)

Taubenschlag (Raphael). *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri, 332 B. C.-640 A. D.* New York, *Herald Square Press*, 1944. Pp. xv + 488.

Templin (Ernest H.). *The Social Approach to Literature.* *Univ. of California Publ. in Modern Philology*, XXVIII, 1, pp. 1-24.

Tillyard (E. M. W.). *The Elizabethan World Picture.* New York, *Macmillan Co.*, 1944. Pp. vii + 108. \$1.75.

Tinker (Edward Larocque). *Will Babel Be Beaten?* Excerpt from *The American Scholar*, pp. 322-328.

Tolles (Delight). *The Banquet-Libations of the Greeks.* Ann Arbor, *Edwards Brothers, Inc.*, 1943. Pp. vii + 114. (Bryn Mawr Diss.)

*Traditio: Studies in Ancient and Medieval History, Thought and Religion*, Vol. I. New York, *Cosmopolitan Science and Art Service Co., Inc.*, 1943. Pp. vii + 418. \$6.50.

*Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, LXXIII (1942). Edited by T. Robert S. Broughton. Lancaster, Pa., *Lancaster Press*, 1943. Pp. vi + 415 + xvi.

Turyn (Alexander), editor. *Pindari Epinicia.* New York, *Herald Square Press*, 1944. Pp. xvi + 224. \$5.00. (*Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, Polish Institute Series*, no. 5.)

Wade (Gladys I.). *Thomas Traherne: A Critical Biography.* Princeton, *Princeton Univ. Press*, 1944. Pp. viii + 269. \$3.00.

Walpole (Ronald N.). *Charlemagne and Roland.* *Univ. of California Publ. in Modern Philology*, XXI, 6 (1944), pp. 385-452.

Youtie (Herbert C.) and Pearl (Orsamus M.). *Papyri and Ostraca from Karanis.* Ann Arbor, *Univ. of Michigan Press*, 1944. Pp. xxi + 252; 7 pls. \$4.00. (*Univ. of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series*, XLVII; *Michigan Papyri*, VI.)

# INDEX TO VOLUME LXV

	PAGE		PAGE
<i>Aeneid</i> , Lucretius and the		Grail, Holy, The Name of	
Sixth Book of the,	135-148	the,	354-363
Aeschylus' <i>Agamemnon</i>	557,	Greek Poetry, Notes on,	172-175
Note on,	247-248		
<i>Agricola</i> , 28,	246	Hadrian, Suetonius in the	
Archons in Athens under the		Civil Service under,	113-123
Empire, The Method of		HAYWOOD, RICHARD M. On	
Choosing,	149-166	the Unity of the <i>Miles</i>	
Aristophanes, Repetition of		<i>Gloriosus</i> ,	382-386
Lines in,	26-36	Herodotus, I, 31, Cicero's	
Athenian Notes,	321-339	Greek Text of,	167-169
Attic Commonplaces of Pity,		Homer and Hector,	209-243
Some,	1-25		
BLAKE, WARREN E. Cicero's		IE Kinship, Latin Dii Indi-	
Greek Text of Herodo-		getes, Dii Novensides,	
tus, I, 31,	167-169	and the Designation of,	364-366
Boethius and the History of		Italic and Celtic,	124-134
the <i>Organon</i> ,	69-74		
BOOKS RECEIVED,		Latin (The) Base of the	
112, 208, 319-320, 419-420		Spanish Suffix <i>-eño</i> ,	372-381
CAPPS, EDWARD. Did Men-		Latin Dii Indigetes, Dii No-	
ander Nod? <i>Epitrepontes</i>		vensides, and the Desig-	
53,	175-178	nation of IE Kinship,	364-366
Celtic and Italic,	124-134	Latin <i>Uxor</i> ,	170-171
Cicero's Greek Text of Hero-		LATTIMORE, RICHMOND. Notes	
dotus, I, 31,	167-169	on Greek Poetry,	172-175
Civil Service under Hadrian,		LAWLER, LILLIAN B. "The	
Suetonius in the,	113-123	Lily" in the Dance,	75-80
CLARK, GORDON H. A Refer-		Lucretius and the Sixth Book	
ence to Plotinus in Lid-		of the <i>Aeneid</i> ,	135-148
dell and Scott,	244-245	LYNCH, C. ARTHUR. <i>Agricola</i> ,	
COMBELLACK, FREDERICK M.		28,	246
Homer and Hector,	209-243	<i>Nicomachean Ethics</i> , VI,	
Cotton in Graeco-Roman		1142 b 19,	248
Egypt,	249-258	Note on Aeschylus' <i>Aga-</i>	
Dance, "The Lily" in the,	75-80	<i>memnon</i> 557,	247-248
Did Menander Nod? <i>Epitre-</i>		Tacitus' <i>Annals</i> , IV, 12,	179-180
<i>pontes</i> 53,	175-178		
DILLON, MYLES. Italic and		MALKIEL, YAKOV. The Latin	
Celtic,	124-134	Base of the Spanish Suffix	
Egypt, Graeco-Roman, Cotton		<i>-eño</i> ,	372-381
in,	249-258	Method (The) of Choosing	
"Epic, as I here define it,"		Archons in Athens under	
	340-353	the Empire,	149-166
<i>Epitrepontes</i> 53, Did Men-		MEZGER, FRITZ. Latin Dii In-	
ander Nod?	175-178	digetes, Dii Novensides	
Germanicus Papyrus, A New		and the Designation of	
Reading of the,	80-82	IE Kinship,	364-366
GOMME, A. W. Athenian		Latin <i>Uxor</i> ,	170-171
Notes,	321-339	MICHEL, AGNES KIRSOPP.	
		Lucretius and the Sixth	
		Book of the <i>Aeneid</i> ,	135-148

	PAGE
<i>Miles Gloriosus</i> , On the Unity of the,	382-386
MILLER, HAROLD W. Repetition of Lines in <i>Aristophanes</i> ,	26-36
MONTGOMERY, H. C. Thomas Jefferson as a Philologist (II),	367-371
MORROW, GLENN R. A Note on the <i>Nicomachean Ethics</i> ,	386
Name (The) of the Holy Grail,	354-363
New (A) Reading of the <i>Germanicus Papyrus</i> ,	80-82
<i>Nicomachean Ethics</i> , VI, 1142 b 19,	248
<i>Nicomachean Ethics</i> , A Note on the,	386
Note on Aeschylus' <i>Agamemnon</i> 557,	247-248
Notes on Greek Poetry,	172-175
NOTOPOULOS, JAMES A. The Method of Choosing Archons in Athens under the Empire,	149-166
On the Unity of the <i>Miles Gloriosus</i> ,	382-386
<i>Organon</i> , Boethius and the History of the,	69-74
Philologist, Thomas Jefferson as a (II),	367-371
PITCHER, SEYMOUR M. "Epic as I here define it,"	340-353
Pity, Some Attic Commonplaces of,	1-25
Plotinus, A Reference to, in Liddell and Scott,	244-245
POST, L. A. A New Reading of the <i>Germanicus Papyrus</i> ,	80-82
Proverb, The Vernacular, in Mediaeval Latin Prose,	37-68
Reference (A) to Plotinus in Liddell and Scott,	244-245
Repetition of Lines in <i>Aristophanes</i> ,	26-36
REVIEWS:	
<i>Amyx's</i> Corinthian Vases in the Hearst Collection at San Simeon (HAZEL PALMER),	292
Athenian Studies Presented to William Scott Ferguson ( <i>Harvard Studies in</i>	

	PAGE
<i>Classical Philology</i> , Supplementary Vol. I) (C. BRADFORD WELLES),	87-97
Bonner's The Literary Treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (R. K. HACK),	97-98
Clark's Eight American Praxapostoloi (MARBURY B. OGLE),	110-112
Classical Studies in Honor of William Abbott Oldfather (DOROTHY M. RO-BATHAN),	277-279
Cohen's <i>Judaica et Aegyptiaca: De Maccabaeorum Libro III Quaestiones Historicae</i> (RALPH MARCUS),	83-85
Colson's Philo with an English Translation, Vol. IX (RALPH MARCUS),	85-87
Dinsmoor's Observations on the Hephaisteion (HOMER A. THOMPSON),	188-191
Dohan's Italic Tomb-Groups in the University Museum (GISELA M. A. RICHTER),	304-305
Dowdell's Aristotle and Anglican Religious Thought (JOHN S. KIEFFER),	318-319
Ehrenberg's The People of Aristophanes: A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy (WILLIAM C. GREENE),	264-270
Elferink's Het Oordeel van den Kerkvader Augustinus over de Romeinsche Oudheid. Bijdragen tot een commentaar op de eerste vijf boeken van "De Civitate Dei" (J. M. F. MARIQUE),	413-414
Ferguson, see Athenian Studies.	
Finley's Thucydides (MALCOLM F. MCGREGOR),	181-185
Goodrich, see Johnson.	
Haight's Essays on the Greek Romances (WARREN E. BLAKE),	274-276
Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. LI (C. BRADFORD WELLES),	87-97

	PAGE
<i>Howe's</i> The Pretorian Prefect from Commodus to Diocletian (A. D. 180-305) (O. W. REINMUTH),	196-200
<i>Hudson's</i> Desiderius Erasmus, <i>The Praise of Folly</i> . Translated from the Latin, with an Essay and Commentary (DON CAMERON ALLEN),	109-110
<i>Johnson and Goodrich's</i> Papyri in the Princeton University Collections, Vol. III (†CLINTON W. KEYES),	185-188
<i>Jones' The Vatnsdalers' Saga</i> . Translated with an Introduction and Notes (STEFÁN EINARSSON),	415-416
<i>Kapp's</i> Greek Foundations of Traditional Logic (PHILLIP DE LACY),	305-306
King, <i>see</i> Laistner.	
<i>Laistner and King's</i> A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts (S. HARRISON THOMSON),	398-400
<i>Lake's</i> Family 13 (The Ferrar Group). The Text according to Mark with a Collation of Codex 28 of the Gospels (FRIEDRICH WALTER LENZ),	317-318
<i>Lattimore's</i> Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs (JAMES HUTTON),	302-303
<i>Lehmann-Hartleben and Olsen's</i> Dionysiac Sarcophagi in Baltimore (SARAH ELIZABETH FREEMAN),	303-304
Lind, <i>see</i> Rouse.	
<i>Little's</i> Myth and Society in Attic Drama (WARREN E. BLAKE),	272-274
<i>Lobel, Roberts, and Wegener's</i> The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XVIII, Edited with Translations and Notes (W. A. OLD-FATHER and LLOYD W. DALY),	387-393
<i>McKinlay's</i> Arator, The Codices (DOROTHY M. ROBATHAN),	279

	PAGE
<i>Mendell's</i> Our Seneca (WILLIAM HARDY ALEXANDER),	105-108
<i>Mylonas' The Hymn to Demeter and her Sanctuary at Eleusis</i> (JOSEPH FONTENROSE),	293-294
<i>Nachmanson's</i> Der griechische Buchtitel. Einige Beobachtungen (FRIEDRICH WALTER LENZ),	315-316
<i>Nilsson's</i> Geschichte der griechischen Religion, erster Band, bis zur griechischen Weltherrschaft (CAMPBELL BONNER),	259-264
Oldfather, <i>see</i> Classical Studies in Honor of.	
<i>Oliver's</i> The Sacred Gerusia (T. ROBERT S. BROUGH-TON),	108-109
Olsen, <i>see</i> Lehmann-Hartleben.	
<i>Pearson's</i> The Local Historians of Attica (ANTONY E. RAUBITSCHKE),	294-297
<i>Persson's</i> The Religion of Greece in Prehistoric Times (ERNST RIESS),	191-196
<i>Prakken's</i> Studies in Greek Genealogical Chronology (MALCOLM F. MCGREGOR),	290-291
<i>Prentice's</i> Those Ancient Dramas Called Tragedies (WILLIAM C. GREENE),	270-272
<i>Pritchett's</i> The Five Attic Tribes after Kleisthenes (C. BRADFORD WELLES),	297-298
<i>Richter's</i> Etruscan Art in the Museum. The Metropolitan Museum of Art: Handbook of the Etruscan Collection (DAVID M. ROBINSON),	410-412
Roberts, <i>see</i> Lobel.	
Rose, <i>see</i> Rouse.	
<i>Rose's</i> The Eclogues of Vergil (E. L. HIGHBARGER),	200-205
<i>Rouse, Rose, and Lind's</i> Nonnos, <i>Dionysiaca</i> , with an English Translation,	



	PAGE		PAGE
Mythological Introduction and Notes, and Notes on Text Criticism, Vols. I-III (Books I-XLVIII) (EUGENE O'NEILL, JR.),	311-315	cilius; The Twelve Tables (E. BOUCHER STEVENS),	206-208
<i>Schubring's</i> Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der hippokratischen Schrift <i>De locis in homine</i> (LUDWIG EDELSTEIN),	98-99	<i>Weber's</i> Schliemann's First Visit to America, 1850-1851 (DAVID M. ROBINSON),	285-286
<i>Skemp's</i> The Theory of Motion in Plato's Later Dialogues (L. A. POST),	298-301	<i>Webster's</i> Greek Interpretations (ALFRED C. SCHLESINGER),	418
<i>Smith's</i> Tiberius and the Roman Empire (VINCENT M. SCRAMUZZA),	401-409	Wegener, <i>see</i> Lobel.	
<i>Tait's</i> Philodemus' Influence on the Latin Poets (RICHARD M. HAYWOOD),	205-206	<i>Weiss's</i> Kausalität und Zufall in der Philosophie des Aristoteles (PHILIP DE LACY),	414-415
<i>Transactions of the International Numismatic Congress</i> Organized and Held in London by the Royal Numismatic Society, June 30-July 3, 1936, on the Occasion of its Centenary (DAVID M. ROBINSON),	283-285	<i>Wolff's</i> Written and Unwritten Marriages in Hellenistic and Post-Classical Roman Law (MAX RADIN),	279-283
<i>Trouard's</i> Cicero's Attitude towards the Greeks (GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH),	310-311	<i>Yale Classical Studies</i> , VIII (ROBERT SAMUEL ROGERS and C. W. PEPPLER),	287-289
<i>Turyn's</i> The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus (ALFRED C. SCHLESINGER),	417-418	SANDERS, HENRY A. Suetonius in the Civil Service under Hadrian,	113-123
<i>Venzke's</i> Die orphischen Argonautika in ihrem Verhältnis zu Apollonios Rhodios (HERMANN FRÄNKEL),	393-398	SOLMSSEN, FRIEDRICH. Boethius and the History of the <i>Organon</i> ,	69-74
<i>Wagenvoort's</i> Imperium, Studien over het "mana"-begrip in zede en taal der Romeinen (ARTHUR DARBY NOCK),	99-105	Spanish Suffix - <i>eño</i> , The Latin Base of the,	372-381
<i>Wallace's</i> The Notes on Philosophy in the Commentary of Servius on the Eclogues, the Georgics, and the Aeneid of Vergil (LUDWIG EDELSTEIN),	306-309	SPITZER, LEO. The Name of the Holy Grail,	354-363
<i>Warmington's</i> Remains of Old Latin, Vol. III: Lu-		† STEINER, ÁRPAD. The Vernacular Proverb in Mediaeval Latin Prose,	37-68
		STEVENS, EDWARD B. Some Attic Commonplaces of Pity,	1-25
		Suetonius in the Civil Service under Hadrian,	113-123
		Tacitus' <i>Annals</i> , IV, 12,	179-180
		Thomas Jefferson as a Philologist (II),	367-371
		<i>Uxor</i> , Latin,	170-171
		Vernacular (The) Proverb in Mediaeval Latin Prose,	37-68
		WINTER, J. G. Cotton in Graeco-Roman Egypt (with H. C. YOUTIE),	249-258
		YOUTIE, H. C. Cotton in Graeco-Roman Egypt (with J. G. WINTER),	249-258

## An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome

- I. *Rome and Italy of the Republic.* By TENNEY FRANK. 445 pages. Now out of print.
- II. *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian.* By ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON. 742 pages, \$4.00.
- III. *The Four Western Provinces.* By R. G. COLLINGWOOD; J. J. VAN NOSTRAND; V. M. SCRAMUZZA; and ALBERT GRENIER. 672 pages. \$4.00.
- IV. *Roman Africa*, by R. M. HAYWOOD, 120 pp.  
*Roman Syria*, by F. M. HEICHELHEIM, 133 pp.  
*Roman Greece*, by J. A. O. LARSEN, 240 pp.  
*Roman Asia*, by T. R. S. BROUGHTON, 420 pp.  
Indices. 950 pages, \$5.00.
- V. *Rome and Italy of the Empire*, by TENNEY FRANK, 461 pages.  
*General Index to Volumes I-V*, 146 pages. 2 volumes \$5.75.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

---

ARISTOTLE'S CRITICISM OF PLATO AND THE ACADEMY, Vol. I

By HAROLD CHERNISS. 637 pages, \$5.00.

ARISTOTLE'S CRITICISM OF PRESOCRATIC PHILOSOPHY

By HAROLD CHERNISS. 432 pages, \$4.00.

THE SYNTAX OF THE GENITIVE CASE IN ARISTOPHANES

By JAMES WILSON POULTNEY. 250 pages, \$3.50.

SELECTIONS FROM THE BRIEF MENTION OF BASIL LANNEAU  
GILDERSLEEVE

Edited with a biographical sketch and an index by CHARLES  
WILLIAM EMIL MILLER. 546 pages, frontispiece, \$4.50.

STUDIES IN HONOR OF HERMANN COLLITZ

By American and foreign scholars. 341 pages, frontispiece, \$5.00.

L'AGNIHOTRA: Description de l'agnihotra dans le rituel védique

Par P.-E. DUMONT. xv + 225 pages, \$3.00 paper and \$3.50  
cloth.

L'ĪŚVARAGĪTĀ, LE CHANT DE ŚIVA

Texte extrait du Kurma-purāṇā. Traduit du Sanskrit par P.-E.  
DUMONT. 251 pages, paper, \$3.00.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

# THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY STUDIES IN ARCHAEOLOGY

EDITED BY DAVID M. ROBINSON

1. *The Roman Toga.* By Lillian M. Wilson. 132 pages. 102 illustrations. \$5.00.
2. *The History and Civilization of Ancient Megara.* By E. L. Highbarger. 234 pages. 6 illustrations. Paper, \$2.50; cloth, \$3.00.
3. *Ancient Sicyon with a Prosopographia Sicyonia.* By Charles H. Skalet. 234 pages. 17 illustrations. \$2.50.
4. *The Negro in Greek and Roman Civilization; A Study of the Ethiopian Type.* By Grace Hadley Beardsley. 154 pages. 24 illustrations. \$3.50.
5. *Les Cultes de Patras: Avec une Prosopographie Patréenne.* By Jules Herbillon. 199 pages. \$3.00.
6. *Excavations at Olynthus. Part I. The Neolithic Settlement.* By George E. Mylonas. 126 pages. 96 plates. \$7.50.
7. *The Greek Tradition in Sculpture.* By Walter R. Agard. 70 pages. 34 illustrations. \$3.00.
8. *Ancient Corinth, with a Topographical Sketch of the Corinthia. Part I. From the Earliest Times to 404 B. C.* By J. G. O'Neill. 270 pages. 9 plates and large folded plan of excavations. \$5.00.
9. *Excavations at Olynthus. Part II. Architecture and Sculpture.* By David M. Robinson. 177 pages. 315 illustrations. \$20.00.
10. *Papyri in the Princeton University Collections.* Edited by Allan Chester Johnson and Henry Bartlett van Hoesen. 169 pages. \$7.50.
11. *Excavations at Olynthus. Part III. The Coins Found at Olynthus.* By David M. Robinson. 143 pages. 28 plates. \$10.00.
12. *Excavations at Olynthus. Part IV. The Terra-Cottas Found at Olynthus.* By David M. Robinson. 119 pages. 62 plates. \$10.00.
13. *Sculptured Portraits of Greek Statesmen: With a Special Study of Alexander the Great.* By Elmer G. Suhr. 202 pages. 21 plates. \$4.50.
14. *Hellenistic Queens: A Study of Woman-Power in Macedonia, Seleucid Syria, and Ptolemaic Egypt.* By Grace Harriet Macurdy. 265 pages. 12 plates. \$4.00.
15. *Early Civilization in Thessaly.* By Hazel D. Hansen. 222 pages. 178 illustrations. \$4.00.
16. *Old Age Among the Ancient Greeks.* By Bessie Ellen Richardson. 391 pages. 16 plates. \$4.00.
17. *A History of Olynthus.* By Mabel Gude. 122 pages. \$2.50.
18. *Excavations at Olynthus. Part V. Mosaics, Vases, and Lamps of Olynthus found in 1928 and 1931.* By David M. Robinson. 320 pages. 209 plates. \$15.00.
19. *Excavations at Olynthus. Part VI. The Coins Found at Olynthus in 1931.* By David M. Robinson. 126 pages. 30 plates. \$10.00.
20. *Excavations at Olynthus. Part VII. The Terra-Cottas of Olynthus Found in 1931.* By David M. Robinson. 123 pages. 61 plates. \$10.00.
21. *Pindar: A Poet of Eternal Ideas.* By David M. Robinson. 126 pages. \$3.00.
22. *Vassal-Queens and Some Contemporary Women under the Roman Empire.* By Grace H. Macurdy. 160 pages. 6 plates. \$3.00.
23. *A Study of the Greek Love-Names, Including a Discussion of Paederasty and a Prosopographia.* By David M. Robinson and Edward J. Fluck. 212 pages. 1 plate. \$3.00.
24. *The Clothing of the Ancient Romans.* By Lillian M. Wilson. 191 pages. 118 illustrations. \$5.00.
25. *Excavations at Olynthus. Part VIII. The Hellenic House.* By David M. Robinson and J. Walter Graham. 391 pages. 36 figures and 111 plates. \$15.00.
26. *Excavations at Olynthus. Part IX. The Chalcidic Mint and the Excavation Coins Found in 1928-1934.* By David M. Robinson and Paul Augustus Clement. 446 pages. 36 plates. \$15.00.
27. *The Ape in Antiquity.* By William C. McDermott. 349 pages. 10 plates. \$5.00.
28. *Etruscan Perugia.* By Chandler Shaw. 115 pages. 16 plates. \$2.75.
29. *The Common People of Pompeii: A Study of the Graffiti.* By Helen H. Tanzer. 113 pages. 49 illustrations. \$3.50.
30. *The Gates of Dreams. An Archaeological Examination of Vergil, Aeneid VI, 893-899.* By E. L. Highbarger. 149 pages. 15 illustrations. \$3.00.
31. *Excavations at Olynthus. Part X. Metal and Minor Miscellaneous Finds. An Original Contribution to Greek Life.* By David M. Robinson. 610 pages. 33 figures. 71 plates. 1 map. \$20.00.
32. *Excavations at Olynthus. Part XI. Necrolynthia. A Study in Greek Burial Customs and Anthropology.* By David M. Robinson. 307 pages. 26 figures. 70 plates. 1 map. \$15.00.
33. *Two Currents in the Thought-Stream of Europe: A History of Opposing Points of View.* By Elmer G. Suhr. 468 pages. \$5.00.
34. *The Political Meeting Places of the Greeks.* By William A. McDonald. 324 pages. 31 figures. 19 plates. \$5.00.
35. *The Horse in Greek Art.* By Sidney David Markman. 223 pages. 62 figures on plates. \$5.00.

